

# CHRIST IN ETHICS

By  
S. P. JACOBS



Class BJ1231

Book J3

Copyright N<sup>o</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.











S. P. JACOBS.

# Christ in Ethics

*By*  
*S. P. JACOBS*



BROADWAY PUBLISHING CO.

835 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

BT1231  
J3

*Copyright, 1912,*  
*By*  
S. P. JACOBS  
Bloomdale, Ohio, U. S. A.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PROLOGUE .....	5
I. ETHICS DEFINED .....	9
II. THE MORAL FACULTY.....	12
III. ETHICS AND RELIGION.....	20
IV. ETHICS AND CHRISTIANITY.....	31
V. ETHICS AND CHRIST.....	51
VI. INDIVIDUAL ETHICS .....	82
VII. ETHICAL PROPHYLAXIS .....	128
VIII. CHRIST IN GOVERNMENT.....	149
IX. THE DIVINE PROVISION.....	219
X. FUTURE ENDLESS PUNISHMENT.....	236



## PROLOGUE.

Ethical writers in common base Christian ethics on the principles of Christ.

This book bases Christian ethics on the principles and *person* of Christ. The relation of Christ to Christian ethics is not only doctrinal, but also vital, personal. "I am the vine; ye are the branches," expresses this relation.

Apart from Christ Himself real Christian ethics cannot exist: "Without me ye can do nothing" (John 15:5). Christian ethics apart from the person of Christ is like man's body apart from the personal spirit that animated it.

This subject is discussed under ten heads. Chapter I. defines Christian ethics related to history, to theology, to aesthetics, and to psychology. The eminent philosopher, Hermann Lotze, rightly declares "The true beginning of metaphysics is in ethics."

Chapter II. treats of the moral faculty at once basal and chief in the hierarchy of mental forces. Its primacy is seen in its less likelihood to err, and in pointing obligation to Deity. It lies at the basis of religion and all moral reform.

Chapter III. shows ethics to be inseparable from religion. Religion constitutes and conditions ethics. God in His kingdom of righteousness and retribution (Rom. 1:16-17) is the stay of Christian ethics.

Chapter IV. traces historic ethics advancing toward Christian ethics. The moral darkness and



the atrocities committed in the name of Christianity during the middle ages, seem now incredible.

Yet war, most cruel of crimes against mankind, has been generally approved until late; but it is rapidly passing out of favor.

Chapter V. views Christ creating man anew, and indwelling and heading a new race styled a "new creation" (2 Cor. 5:17). Christ's consciousness becomes the Christian consciousness (John 17:21-23).

Chapter VI. discusses at length the results of Christ dwelling in the believer, changing his entire being (Rom. 12:1,2), counteracting heredity and shaping offspring. Sexual hygiene secures power of parenthood, infancy, youth, and marital purity, disclosing marital wrongs and crimes menacing the family and the nation.

Chapter VII. deals with diet, dress, and personal habits, respecting the foregoing evils.

Chapter VIII. "Christ in government" begins a new era in politics and business. Capital and labor complement each other. Oneness in all interests unites all mankind in actual brotherhood, and world-leadership is the crown of moral leadership.

Chapter IX. shows the Divine provision enabling business and government to be carried on without sin. By the atonement we participate in God's holiness and sovereignty, "are called into His kingdom and glory" (1 Thess. 2:12). All this is implied in the pre-Pentecostal prayer taught by Christ to His disciples: "Thy kingdom come; they will be done in earth as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10). In heaven all employments and government proceed without sin.

Chapter X. discusses future endless punishment as just retribution upon those who ignore and despise God's rule in time and eternity: "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribula-

tion to them that trouble you . . . When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power" (2 Thess. 1:6-9).

Future endless punishment of the impenitent, persistent wicked is required to vindicate Divine righteousness and to maintain the moral welfare of the universe; and herein it is a manifestation of Divine love, as this chapter shows.

This book is sent forth to meet a present need. Readers who think the writer extreme on certain points; instance, eugenics and marital purity, also the conducting municipal, state and national government free from wrong, are cordially invited to a careful study of these points as supported by modern scientific research and Holy Writ.

A second careful reading of this book will richly repay the effort.

That it may advance the cause of personal purity and promote the domestic and political welfare, is the prayer of the writer,

S. P. JACOBS,  
Bloomdale, O.



# Christ In Ethics

## CHAPTER I.

### ETHICS DEFINED.

Ethics is a progressive science. It will progress while man progresses. Its terms, as to content, extent, and intent, are not of fixed limit, like those in mathematics. In kind, scope, and depth, ethics advances with man's advancing toward ever higher and higher perfection in self-improvement and in social, civic, and nature-culture; for nature degraded by man's fall in Eden, shares with him the restoration (Rom. 8:19-22). This point will be made clear further on. The moral significance of creation cannot be destroyed.

Ethics has been variously defined. This comes from viewing this question from different standpoints. From the standpoint of moral obligation, Noah Webster says, "Ethics is the science of duty." As related to the Divine government, Dr. Wayland calls it "the science of moral law." From the viewpoint of man's free agency, President Mark Hopkins defines it as "The science of man choosing and acting from choice under moral law."

Furthermore, "Ethics is the science of the moral" (Wuttke); "The science which teaches men their

duty and the reasons for it" (Paley); "The science which treats of morals, the science of right" (Haven); "The systematic application of the ultimate rule of right to all conceptions of moral conduct" (Hiccock); "A code of rules for the regulation of conduct among men as they should be" (Herbert Spencer).

The writer would define Christian ethics to be the free concurrence of God and man in all moral relations and activities, according to the New Testament; or having all the mind of Christ (Phil. 2:5; Eph. 4:13) and walking as He walked (Col. 1:10) "in all manner of living" (1 Pet. 1:15.)

A mental concept, a feeling, a motive, a principle, an act, a character, is moral when right can be declared of it; contrariwise, it is immoral.

Ethics involves kindred sciences. Viewing the sense of the beautiful in character, in nature, and in art, ethics enters the province of aesthetics. Considering the faculties of the mind employed in the moral activities of the human personality, gives to ethics quite a section in psychology. Right, dominating the community, regulating commerce, permeating all business corporations, state legislation and international treaties, introduces ethics into the realm of political economy. To study man at his best as related to God and His law; as related to sin and its guilt, pollution, and penalty; as related to the Divine atonement securing salvation from sin and restoration to God, involving all the moral precepts of the gospel, includes in ethics largely the domain of systematic theology.

Ethics and history are very closely related. In fact, history is concrete ethics, in large part. History is largely the product of ethical forces in mankind. Rightly does Dr. Adolf Wuttke declare: "A

real understanding of history is not possible without ethics; universal history is the realization of the moral—the good and also the evil—within humanity; hence history . . . is an important teacher of morality” (*Christian Ethics*, Vol. I., p. 17).

High culture gives ethics a wide sweep. It dominates every human activity. Every faculty takes higher rank. It throws new light upon relations to God and to mankind. A chief among foremost philosophers, Hermann Lotze, has well said: “The true beginning of metaphysics is ethics.”

## CHAPTER II.

## THE MORAL FACULTY.

A faculty is not a member of the mind as the eye or the ear is a member, or organ of the body. "Man is not an organism, but an intelligence acting through an organism" (McCosh).

Noah Webster defines faculty as "the ability to act, to perform, whether inborn or cultivated; the capacity for any of the well-known classes of mental activity."

The entire personality acts in a given way, or is conscious of a given state (Porter); hence the moral faculty is the ability, capacity for moral acting and moral feeling.

Unlike the other faculties, as memory, reason, and imagination, the moral faculty, or conscience, has in it the element of authority, producing a feeling of obligation.

Defined more fully, conscience is the perception of right and of wrong in act, feeling, and motive, under a sense of obligation to embrace the right and oppose the wrong. Dr. Charles Hodge rightly declares: "It is admitted that conscience is less liable to err than reason; and when they come into conflict, real or apparent, our moral nature is the stronger, and will assert its authority in spite of all we can do" (System. Theology, Vol. I., p. 7).

This sense of moral obligation implies a Supreme One to whom we are obligated. As our internal sensations imply, the external world, so our internal sense of moral obligation implies the external Deity to whom we are obligated.



In the latter case the evidence is the stronger; for our external senses may deceive us, whereas our internal self-consciousness is infallible. This is conceded by all philosophers, whatever their religious views.

Sir William Hamilton declares: "That given in consciousness is undoubtedly true." Likewise John Stuart Mill: "Whatever is known by consciousness, is known beyond the possibility of question." The latter illustrates the truth stated by Dr. McCosh: "The greatest skeptics have allowed that we must trust consciousness" (*Christianity and Positivism*, p. 194).

The idea of God is unavoidable. Conscience in man implies God as truly as wings in the bird imply the open air. Dr. Fisher is right: "Out of man's perception of his own personal attributes arises the belief in a personal God . . . Man's personality denotes God's personality. Together they stand or fall" (*Grounds of Theistic and Christic Belief*, p. 2).

To long for God, is universal. It may be rudely expressed; but man everywhere exhibits it in some form of worship. President McCosh, of Princeton University, truly declared, "Everywhere in all countries, in ancient as in modern times, in civilized as well as in barbarous nations, we find him a worshipper at some altar, be it venerable, degraded or bloodstained" (*Divine Government*).

It is evident that conscience in man is not accidental—a result of training or of habit. Its germ, like that of memory and of imagination, is inborn in human nature; and, like memory and imagination, it may be cultivated or perverted. The deep Dr. Frantz Delitzsch rightly declares that "Conscience is inseparable from the personal nature of

man, and comes into being contemporaneously therewith" (Biblical Psychology, p. 168).

Concurring in this view is Dr. Adolf Wuttke, University of Halle, and among psychologists easily a foremost writer on ethics. He says, "Conscience is a revelation of the moral law as the Divine will . . . In its germ it is a primitive and not a derived power . . . Conscience is essentially an integral part in man's God-likeness . . . The conscience, as differing from the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 9:1), is a power inherent in the essence of man *per se*, see Rom. 2:14, 15, in proof: "When the Gentiles who have not the law do by nature the things of the law, these, not having the law, are a law unto themselves; in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them." R. V. (Christian Ethics, Vol. II., p. 100).

In man's normal state, the idea of God and conscience are inseparable. The dimness of this idea denotes the depth of man's degradation. "Only the fool hath said in his heart, there is no God" (Psa. 53:1). But even this denial proves the presence of the idea of God.

Apart from the regenerating (John 3:5-7) and the transforming (Rom. 12:2) power of divine grace, man seems a creature of two contrary natures. To turn from himself to God or from God to himself, seems to violate the plan of his own being. He actually is a contradiction of himself.

Under increasing light, these two inward contrary forces swell into a tumult—a tempest—of the soul. From this standpoint, Pliny the Elder (23-79 A.D.) bemoans man, "A being full of contradic-

tions; he is the most wretched of creatures, since other creatures have no wants transcending the bounds of their natures. Man is full of desires and wants that can never be satisfied. His nature is a lie, uniting the greatest poverty with the greatest pride. Among these so great evils, the best thing God has bestowed upon man is the power to take his own life" (Neander's Church History).

Contemporaneous with Pliny was that eminent Pharisee—now famous apostle of Christ—as was Pliny a famous naturalist. Paul experienced, like Pliny, this inward combat of contrary moral forces. His portrayal is pathetic: "That which I do, I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I . . . For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh (earthly nature) dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me, but to do that which is good is not. For the good which I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not that I do . . . O, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" R. V. (Rom. 7:15-24).

Paul and Pliny alike deplore man's wretched moral condition. But Paul facing despair shouts his triumph, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord! . . ." The law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death ("warring against the law of my mind." Rom. 7:23). "We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose . . ." "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or peril, or sword? Nay! in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death

nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature [creation] shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:28, 35-39).

Why Paul's ecstatic triumph in place of Pliny's deep despair? Conscience; nothing but conscience. Pliny fought his conscience; Paul crowned his. Pliny, rejecting the moral teachings of Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero, violated the "law written in the heart." In consequence, he became a God-ignoring "agnostic" [Encyclop. Britannica] commending suicide as the only hope against despair under the pangs of a guilty conscience.

This "law written in the heart" at man's beginning holds over through the successive dispensations of Divine grace. Before man's fall, it was a perfect image of God's character (Col. 3:10) and an accurate expression of His will (Rom. 2:15).

By the fall this image was greatly dimmed, but not defaced; for "from [since] the creation of the world the things that are made," clearly reveal the invisible things of God "even His eternal power and God-head; so that they [with no written law] are without excuse" (Rom. 1:20).

This inward law, or moral faculty, surviving the fall is proof that it is, like memory and reason, essentially inherent. Dr. F. Delitzsch well says: "The heathen doing by nature what the revealed law claims, they bear witness to the fact that a knowledge of what is right before God, is established in the creatively ordained constitution of man" (Biblical Psychology, p. 163).

Although this inward law was greatly obscured by the fall, yet it becomes a potent factor in man's restoration through Christ. Without this inward

law authorizing the written law with its institutions, restoration to God's character and will would not be possible.

It has the sacredness and the sovereignty of the written law: "For as many as have sinned without law [written] shall also perish without law [written]; and as many as have sinned in the law [written] shall be judged by the law [written]" Rom. 2:12.

In the light of this "law written in the heart," excuse for sin is out of the question; hence the Scriptures require holiness under the different successive dispensations of the Divine government (Gen. 17:1, 9-14; Lev. 19:2, 18, 34; Deut. 30:6; 1 Pet. 1:14-16; 1 Thess. 5:23, 24).

Not only man is destined to reflect the image of God, but nature as well in its order (Rom. 1:19-20): "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge" etc. (Psa. 19:1.) But because of dullness of hearing and dimness of sight, incurred by the fall, the language of the physical universe is but little understood. Unrenewed man discerns but dimly the spiritual significance of creation.

The spiritual significance of man and of subordinate creation is regained again through the vicarious death of Christ (Eph. 4:20-24; Col. 3:10; Heb. 10:16; John 10:14, 15; 17:21-23). Further on, this point will be made plainer.

Only of late the moral faculty begins to receive the consideration it merits. With us, Christian ethics is yet in its infancy. Psychologists have discussed the human mind as constituted of intellect, sensibilities, and will. His moral faculty—the most important thing in him—has received on part of

psychologists, but little consideration. Only a few decades ago President W. F. Warren, Boston University, declared. "The science of Christian ethics is with us almost unknown" (Wuttke's Chr. Eth., Preface VII). With this as with Christianity itself, our views have been very, *very* superficial. But now moral scientists not only, but all real philosophers, are seeing man's moral nature, or moral faculty, to be an original element in man's constitution, and the basis of religion the most important thing concerning him.

The moral faculty as inborn and as cultivated is receiving fuller consideration in late years on part of some leading German psychologists.

As inborn it is more a feeling than an inference or even perception. It is a tendency. This tendency to the right, to feel after God (Acts 17:27), is aptly expressed by the German *ahnung*, as used by the foremost philosophers, Lotze and Ulrichi, in discussing this subject. The term *ahnung* is from *ahnen*, "to have a presentiment of, to have a dim feeling or inkling after" (Whitney).

This tendency, presentiment, or dim feeling, is the initial manifestation of the moral faculty designed to be developed into a clear God-consciousness in Christianity. Any seemingly exceptionable cases can be referred to heredity or abnormal conditions of mind and body. Without a right conception of the moral faculty, man is not understood.

Akin to the moral faculty—conscience, is the spiritual function—believing. In the scale of forces—mechanical, chemical, vital, intellectual and moral, the moral faculty is chief; just so is believing among the human functions chief. Psychology affirms that, as the senses reveal the physical world just so faith reveals the spiritual and greater



world which rules it, and can not be known by the senses or the mental activities themselves: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God . . . Neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2:14). Therefore, "we have received the Spirit of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God" (1 Cor. 2:12); "that we might receive the promised Spirit *through faith*" (Gal. 3:14), who reveals the Son and the Father (John 14:21-23); "That Christ may dwell *in your hearts by faith* . . . unto all the fullness of God" (Eph. 3:17-19).

The believer is thus God-held (John 10:28, 29), mutually God-knowing (John 10:14,15), and mutually God-centred (John 17:21-23). And faith by virtue of its supreme rank over "all things" (Mark 9:23) and its sovereign scope (Rom. 8:38, 39) is the efficient instrument actualizing Christ in ethics.



## CHAPTER III.

## ETHICS AND RELIGION.

We have seen already that ethics and religion are very closely related. And by religion is not now meant the Christian religion, but religion in general, whether monotheistic or polytheistic.

In general, "religion is the outward act, or form, by which men indicate their recognition of the existence of a god or of gods having power over their destiny, to whom obedience, service, and honor are due; a system of faith and worship; a manifestation of piety, as ethical religions, monotheistic religions, etc." (Webster).

Religion, like ethics, is grounded in man's moral nature. And in germ it is as clearly attested as any fact in his physical being. Professor Tyndal very justly declares "The facts of religious feeling are to me as certain as the facts of physics."

While ethics concerns the outworking into active life, of the moral "law written in the heart" [Chapter II.], religion is the upward action of that law linking man to God, whereby is secured the development and the perpetuity of ethics. Religion and ethics of necessity correlate. When religion declines, ethics must decay.

Ancient Greece is a strong example of this. Greece reached its maximum of power under Pericles (469-429 B. C.). Their religion for centuries had been theocentric. The supreme Deity and his subordinates ruled the seen and the unseen.

Freemen [the population was mostly slave] re-

vered divine authority, and obeyed law in the light of present reward and of future retribution.

Aeschylus (525-450 B. C.) very forcibly declares their constructive faith: "Death is no escape to the wicked from their sins or the consequences of them. Their crimes will follow them into another world. . . . In Hades also there is a tribunal which the wicked cannot escape, and a faithful record of their lives; and a just Judge will certainly bring them to judgment and punishment according to their deeds" (*Lost Forever*, p. 303).

Likewise, a hundred years later, Plato (429-327 B. C.): "We ought always to believe those ancient and sacred words which declare to us that the soul is immortal, that judges are appointed; and that they pass the highest sentence of condemnation when the spirit leaves the body" (*Lost Forever*, p. 303).

It was under this wholesome teaching that ancient Greece rose to peerless primacy in culture, and eclipsed all ancient civilizations in glory.

But a change came. "Philosophy passed its meridian in Plato and Aristotle" (*Encyclopædia Britannica*). Through Aristotle religion began to become anthropo-centric, exalting the human in place of the divine. This appears in his teachings as set forth by Dr. Adolf Wuttke: "Freeborn man is by nature thoroughly good, hence has in his own reason the pure fountain of moral knowledge."

"In Aristotle morality is entirely rooted in the soil of the subject [man]; it appears less as the holy will of God to man, than as the absolutely normal essence of the spiritual life as called forth by the rational human spirit itself."

"In Plato the goal of moral striving lies in God-likeness and in the pleasure of God in man; in Aris-

tote the subjective character comes decidedly into the foreground, namely, in the thought that this goal is the personal well-being of the moral subject" (Christian Ethics, Vol. I., p. 94).

Furthermore: "In Plato the highest and truest is, and remains, an object of the yon-side [next world]; in Aristotle . . . all that is true becomes a quality of the this-side [present world], and that, too, not as brought into reality from without, but as wrought out from within (ditto Vol. I., pp. 94, 95).

This rationalistic trend in Aristotle is affirmed also by the eminent cyclopædists, McClintock and Strong: As to Plato, "The end of all his teaching is to show, in opposition to the Sophists, that the mind of man is not its own standard; the tendency of Aristotle's teaching is to show that it is" (Biblic. Theolog. Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I., p. 397).

Divorcing ethics from religion divorces religion from God, degrading both ethics and religion in consequence; and human reason displacing divine authority becomes darkened, and dooms its subject to blinding skepticism and final destruction. Such was the course pursued by ancient Greece. The same is true of all other fallen nations of the past.

Subordinating ethics to religion recognizing the sovereignty of Deity and the certainty of future retribution, is not an optional speculation of philosophy. It is a fundamental principle in the divine government and also in organized human society. This is well-stated by the eminent French philosopher, Baron de Montesquieu: "The idea of a place of future rewards necessarily implies a place of future punishments; and where the people hope for the one without a fear of the other, civil laws have no force." (Spirit of Law, p. 246.)

This principle is so obvious that even infidels admit it. Lord Bolingbroke: "The doctrine of future rewards and punishments has a great tendency to enforce laws and restrain the vices of men." (Shedd. Hist. Christ. Doctrine, Vol. I., p. 201.) Likewise Mr. Hume: "Disbelief in futurity loosens the ties of morality, and may be supposed to be pernicious to civil society." (Bates, Cyclop. of Laws, p. 483.)

This doctrine of divine government with its present providence and future retribution has enabled China and Japan to achieve their great prosperity and marvelous perpetuity for thousands of years.

The Chinese Dragon denotes absolute divine justice bringing certain punishment upon every transgression. This has preserved a keen sense of sin, and given high ideals and strong support to morals. The Chinese Emperor, Buo, three thousand years ago, punished drunkenness with the death-penalty.

His system, modified, was introduced into Japan, and was operated nearly a thousand years. In fact, its influence is still manifest. Recently, under the administration of Japan's eminent Premier, Prince Ito, a soldier of Japan at Ping Hang, Korea, "ran amuck"—with bayonet chasing one through the American Methodist Mission. Prince Ito ordered a penalty of two months at hard labor; and the colonel, major, captains and lieutenants of the regiment were disciplined by confinement from three to seven days. In China the criminal and his near-friends receive like punishment. Early Hebrew civilization affords analogous cases—Korah, Numb. 16:23-34; Achan, Josh. 7:20-26.

This high regard for Heaven's authority and a keen sense of sin must be regarded as the secret

of the stability of China and of Japan during the past several thousand years.

The ethics of China and of Japan merits further consideration. As to China, moral character strong enough to overcome the invasion of Genghis Khan in the Thirteenth Century and strong enough to survive the subjugation by the Manchu dynasty in the Seventeenth Century and yet retain their own language, government and religion, and, above all, to absorb and assimilate their conquerors, evinces force of character without a parallel.

Such flexibility and power of endurance must be the product of their religion; for "Religion is the most powerful social force known to man; beyond anything else it has shaped, and is shaping, the world's history." (Dr. R. T. Ely, *Social Law of Service*, p. 20.) Religion is the summit of power in a man or a nation.

The religion of China has been Theo-centric—God-centred, in start and aim. The emperor styled *The Son of Heaven*, has been sole high priest at the "altar of Heaven" in Peking—a worship wholly distinct from the state-religion of Confucianism.

Annually, at the time of the Winter solstice, the emperor, with fasting and contemplation, prostrates himself before Heaven, offering bullocks in sacrifice for himself and for the nation.

In his daily living he observes this principle: "He that complies with Heaven is preserved; he that rebels against Heaven is ruined." (*Book of Changes*.) This worship of the patriarchal age is the golden link uniting China to Heaven. Herein is the secret and the source of China's transcendent perpetuity.

Still further: A nation's literature indicates its moral rank. In this, China outranks all other na-

tions, Christian as well as Pagan. There is nothing to offend woman's finer sensibilities. Mr. Thomas Taylor Meadows, long a chief resident in China, makes this remarkable statement: "No people, whether of ancient or modern times, has possessed a sacred literature so completely exempt as the Chinese from licentious descriptions and from every offensive expression. There is not a single sentence in the whole of their sacred books and their annotations that may not, when translated word for word, be read in any family in England" (Trumbull White, *War in East*, p. 140).

Likewise, "in their painting and sculpture, scrupulous care is taken to avoid all indecent and immoral associations and suggestions" (White).

What a contrast, this, with ancient Greece and Rome, and with modern Europe and America!! Much of our stage, illustrated press, popular romance, advertising methods, and billboard practice is openly immoral.

Further still: China showed her superior rank in ethics when, being urged by the representatives of Christian England to legalize the opium trade and make it a source of revenue, the emperor replied that he would "not use as a means of revenue that which brought suffering and misery upon his people" (*War in East*, p. 139).

This incident verifies the remarkable statement of Mr. Brinkley that "No other" nation has reached a moral and national elevation so high above contemporaneous states" (*Japan and China*).

That China will hold high rank as a world-power in the progress of the future, is assured by the following: "Tai Hung Chi and Viceroy Tuan Fong, as Imperial Commissioners, came to the United States in 1906; and in his address February 1st,



Tuan Fong declared: "We take pleasure in bearing testimony of to the progress of the Chinese people. They have borne the light of Western civilization into every nook and corner of the empire . . . The awakening of China now at hand may be traced in no small measure to the hand of the missionary. For this service you will find China not ungrateful . . . The spirit of modern enterprise seems to be in the very air you breathe. But *this spirit*, in order not to be injurious to society, *must be guided by a strong sense of moral obligation.*"

China's progressive viceroy, *Chang Chi Tung*, has placed the New Testament in the schools of his vast domain, saying that "while Confucian teachings were good in their place, there was a life and vigor in Western learning which must be sought in their sacred book."

In like spirit the Chinese ambassador at Washington remarked: "It is difficult to start China on the path of modern progress; but when she does move, it will be impossible to stop her."

Akin to this, a statesman of China said in alluding to China's awakening: "It is difficult to set in motion a great mass of solid matter; but, once in motion, it will strike with tremendous impact."

Such is the forecast of China as a world-power.

Japan, a unique nation, this. It is the "only Oriental country that has a government of its own, in which there is absolute freedom in religious belief and practice, and in which there is no state religion and no state support" (Trumbull White).

Notwithstanding this manifold toleration, Japan as a government is intensely religious; and has been so from the beginning. Oral tradition traces both government and country to divine origin. Their traditional cosmogomy affirms chaos in the



beginning, containing the germ of all things.

"And from chaos was evolved a race of heavenly beings—the celestial *Kami*, of whom *Izanagi*, a male, and *Izanami*, a female, were the last individuals. By their union was produced the islands of Japan. Among their children were *Amaterasu*, the sun-goddess and her younger brother, *Susanoo*, afterward appointed god of the sea . . . To her grandson, *Ninigi-no-mikoto*, was given absolute rule over the earth. And his great grandson, *Jimmu Tenno*, was the first historic emperor of Japan. So, all the Mikados are directly descended from the sun-goddess, the principal Shinto divinity" (Trumbull White, *War in the East*, pp. 189-193).

The Mikados being regarded as semi-divinities, only the nobility, nearest about the monarch have been permitted to see his sacred person. Only of late has this custom been changed.

The ruling Mikado being considered heaven's true vice-gerent, and the very soil of his empire being regarded as the product of union in the Deity, has created in the Japanese an all-dominant religious sentiment and a burning patriotism rising into homage ready to burst into a paroxysm of national glorification, as was illustrated in the late Russo-Japanese war, when aged men begging a place in the Mikado's army, and, on refusal because of extreme age, at once committed suicide.

This supreme religious sentiment was manifested by *Admiral Togo*. When the fleet of *Rojesvensky* was suddenly swept from the sea, the Mikado complimented Admiral Togo and his men. The admiral replied: that the unexpected success was due to the brilliant virtue of his majesty and to superintending providence, and "not to the action of any human being."

Concerning the source of the marvelous progress of Japan in the recent past, *Prince Ito*, styled the "maker of modern Japan," has declared: "Japan's progress and development are due to the influence of missionaries exerted in the right direction when Japan was first studying the outer world" (*Woman's Missionary Friend*, December, 1904).

The continuance of their rapid progress into the future is assured by the eternal principles of righteousness now avowed by Japan's guiding statesmen.

Ex-Premier *Count Okuma* declares: "The efforts which Christians are making to supply to the country a high standard of conduct are welcomed by all right-thinking people. As you read your Bible you may think it is antiquated, out of date. The words it contains may so appear; but the noble life which it holds up to admiration is something that will never be out of date, however much the world may progress. Live and preach this life, and you will supply the nation just what it needs at the present juncture."

In another address at the commencement exercises of the Aoyama College (Japan) the same eminent statesman said: "I believe that Christianity is the most advanced form of civilization" . . .

"There is a possibility, I think, that the centre of civilization will come round to the far east when this advanced religion [Christianity] has rightly been interwoven into the thought of the nation, and the nation has progressed with the times.

"I believe that any nation that makes an antiquated faith its state religion, will soon cease to exist. Therefore, I hope that you will endeavor to live up to the teachings of Christ."

Likewise an ex-member of the Imperial Cabinet,

*Baron Maejima*, boldly declares: "I firmly believe that we must have religion at the basis of our national and personal welfare. No matter how large an army or navy we may have, unless we have righteousness at the foundation of our national existence, we shall fall short of the highest success. I do not hesitate to say that we must rely upon religion for our highest welfare. And when I look about me to see what religion we may best rely upon, I am convinced that the religion of Christ is the most full of strength and promise for the nation."

Securely anchored in Deity, Japan guided by such illustrious statesmen, is rapidly and safely changing from past Theo-centric rule into future Christocentric rule.

China and Japan have been sending imperial embassies accompanied by learned commissioners representing various departments of government, to the leading Christian powers in order to study and report on the methods and resources of Western civilization. They have been sending hundreds of chosen young men to Western universities for training to become the future administrators of government. And their young women by thousands have been crowding home colleges for women. All this secures for the future their ever growing prosperity on the basis of national and individual righteousness declared by their guiding statesmen.

Any forecast of the world's destiny during the Twentieth Century and what nations will be in the lead, must include Japan and China among the chief world-forces.

Their marvelous perpetuity beyond three thousand years is divine proof of their moral integrity (Exod. 20:12; Prov. 14:34; Acts 17:26, 27). In

fact, Japan and China as governments have obeyed the unwritten moral law of the heart with such care as to achieve moral rank superior to most Christian nations that have always had God's written law.

Recent transformations, political and religious, in the Orient denote the fulfilling of the words of America's great statesman, Hon. Wm. H. Seward, who declared in 1852, before railway, telegraph, or steamship served international commerce with Asia, viz., "The Pacific Ocean, its shores, islands, and vast region beyond, will be the chief centre of the world's events in the near hereafter."

And now [1910] besides "various sailings of chartered freight steamers of more or less regularity," the *Bureau of Navigation* gives *seven* regular steamship lines between Asia and the United States alone, with a trade in the calendar year 1909 amounting to \$258,000,000. In 1907 it aggregated \$300,000,000.

And the trade of Asia with "all the other countries of the world, including the United States," amounts annually to more than \$4,000,000,000 (Bureau Statistics). It is said that a total of *sixteen* lines of steamships belt the Pacific Ocean. Mr. Seward's statement in 1852 seems actual prophecy.

Abiding national supremacy depends on national righteousness, and national righteousness depends on true religion. "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord" (Psa. 33:12).

## CHAPTER IV.

## ETHICS AND CHRISTIANITY.

We have seen that religion controls and conserves ethics. Christian ethics regulates human conduct according to Christianity, or rather usually according to the customary conception of Christianity. For, be it noted that historic Christianity is not identical with New Testament Christianity. Consequently the ethics of one so-called Christian people varies from the ethics of another so-called Christian people. And the ethics of one such people at a given time differs from the ethics of the same people at another time. Instance: All the so-called Christian nations now abhor human slavery, whereas they once practiced it as a natural condition of organized society.

This sentiment seems to have been imbibed along with some other principles of Greek philosophy. In the time of Plato and Aristotle slavery was deemed essential in the foundation of a free state. Only the *Hellene* was regarded a truly moral personality. All other peoples were barbarians. There was then no such conception as universal humanity.

Foreigner and national foe were regarded as identical; and ancient Rome expressed both by the same word, *hostis*. Even to this day, this is the perplexing problem of international ethics, as is indicated by the tremendous armaments of the nations.

The progress of so-called Christian ethics toward the New Testament standard has been very slow. Past ideals in the ethics of historic Christianity ap-

pear in sharp contrast with even present best standards of morality.

Under Henry VIII. (1539 A.D.) the British Parliament passed an "Act for Abolishing Diversity of Opinions," by which persons of faith and practice at variance with the royal manifesto were condemned to suffer the pains of death as felons, or be imprisoned during the King's pleasure" (Daniel's Hist. Methodism, p. 49).

During the brief reign of his daughter, Mary ["Bloody Mary"], two hundred and seventy-seven persons were burned alive for their faith [Protestant]. Among them were one archbishop, three bishops, twenty-one clergymen, eighty-four tradesmen, one hundred husbandmen, fifty-five women, and four children! Among her victims were Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer (Encyclo. Brittanica).

"In England under Richard II. a law was made that no laborer should move from one place to another, which law was reaffirmed under George II. and George III. And if a laborer refused to work for wages fixed by law he was whipped through town till his back was covered with blood. A second offense they punished by cutting off his right ear; and, for a third offense, they put him to death. In 1530 an unskilled laborer was paid one penny a day of fourteen hours of hard work" (Winterbottom, Cent. Chr. Advoc., August 29, 1900).

As relics of that age of cruelty, may be seen in the Tower of London five hundred and eighty instruments of torture to compel agreement with the accepted standard of faith.

On the continent a similar state of savage morals (?) existed. "The traveler sees the Witch Towers, the torture chambers, and the collection of instruments of torture in various towns, notably Nurem-



berg, Ratisbon, Munich, and The Hague . . . The executioner's tariffs as late as the middle of the Eighteenth Century—that issued by the Archbishop Elector of Cologne in 1757 . . . Examples from this tariff are: (1) For tearing asunder with four horses, 5 thalers, 26 ull; (2) for quartering, 4 thalers; (5) for beheading and burning, 5 thalers, 26 ull; (7) for strangling and burning, 4 thalers; (9) for burning alive, 4 thalers; (11) for breaking a man alive on the wheel, 4 thalers, etc., etc.” (Andrew D. White, *May Atlantic*).

“Three hundred years ago Russia hung political criminals on hooks, blinded them and struck off their legs. The year 1670 dates the “beginning to be left off,” the custom to tie up wives by the hair and flogging them” (Dr. Collins, *Phys. to Czar*). “Not many years ago an annual sale of wives was held on Whit Sunday, after the plan followed by the Assyrians” (Dr. J. H. Kellog, *Plain Facts*, p. 138).

But for the incontrovertible testimony, such atrocities committed in honor of Christianity (?) would be incredible. Such crude conceptions of Christianity show the depth of human depravity.

Colonial legislation in America can furnish similar instances of savage ethics (?). Lord Baltimore's “Toleration Act” applied only to Trinitarians. Disbelief in the Trinity was adjudged a crime punishable with death. Hence Jews did not immigrate into Maryland” (*Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America*, Vol. II., p. 336).

“In the Virginia Colony absence from church was a crime—on third offense—punished with death.”

Here the death-penalty was inflicted without the cruel tortures practiced in Europe.

In the Plymouth Colony “conversing with the divel by way of witchcraft or the like, shall be a

capitall offense lyable to death." Likewise in Connecticut, "If any person be a witch, he or she shall be put to death." By the New Haven "blue laws," "If any person turns Quaker he shall be banished, and not suffered to return but upon pain of death." The anti-Quaker law of Virginia was the same (Blue Laws).

As illustrative of the crude notions of religion taken for Christianity in those days, in sharp contrast with the Puritans farther north, "In Virginia a royal governor could say, as late as 1671, 'I thank God there are no free schools nor printing; and I hope we shall not have them these hundred years; for learning has brought disobedience and misery and sects into the world; and printing has divulged them and libels against the best government. God keep us from both'" (Goldwin Smith, *Lectures of Study of History*, p. 195).

The Christianity of the Eighteenth Century, although freed from the self-centred, savage legalism of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, yet was no actual advance in Scriptural holiness. It was less cruel and less destructive of the free ethical spirit, but not more constructive of positive godliness. It offered an inviting field to English deism and French infidelity.

Bishop Butler says, "The church was only a subject of mirth and ridicule." The Bishop of Litchfield declared: "Sin in general has grown so hardened and rampant as that immoralities are defended, yea, justified on principle. Every kind of sin has found a writer to vindicate and teach it, and a book-seller to spread it."

Baron de Montesquieu declared: "Not more than four or five members of the House of Commons were regular attendants at church." The Rev. Au-



gustus M. Toplady, himself a minister of the Established Church, said: "At that period [1728 A.D.] a *converted* minister in the establishment was as great a wonder as a comet" (Daniel's Hist. Methodism, pp. 53.55).

Similar conditions existed in America. Joseph Cook declares that "One hundred and fifty years ago the new birth in New England was a novelty." Dr. Lyman Beecher attended an ordination [about 1816 A.D.] at which forty dollars' worth of intoxicating liquors was drunk by New England ministers" (Cook's Lecture, December, 1878).

The only successful barrier against the incoming flood of iniquity was the Wesleyan Reformation which "prevented England from relapsing into barbarism," and the "great awakening" under President Edwards, which, with transplanted Methodism conquered English deism and French infidelity, making the United States a possibility.

Even at the present time [1910] there still rests upon ethics the incubus of past ignorance, superstition, and unbelief, not to say crime.

Not to mention extremes in high living and extravagances in dress and jewelry [\$600,000,000]—both under ban of Scripture (1 Tim. 2:9; 1 Pet. 3:3, 4)—and the harmful habit of chewing gum [\$24,000,000], let us note the more destructive habit of using tobacco [\$800,000,000].

Many clergymen and very many laymen in the church are slaves to the filthy habit; and many of the traders in tobacco are members of the church. From a financial point of view the aspect is grievous: Tobacco, \$800,000,000; chewing gum, \$24,000,000; jewelry, \$600,000,000, to which may be added theatrical amusements, \$400,000,000, aggregating \$1,824,000,000. All this for personal gratification,

while only \$6,000,000 is given to evangelize foreign non-Christian peoples! That is, about \$303 for need-less self-gratification, and \$1 for foreign missions!

How such self-indulgence can be reconciled with Christian ethics, in the face of Christ's command to "gospelize all nations" (Matt. 28:19), is incomprehensible.

But the darkest blot on American morals is the atrocious "liquor traffic" with its flagitious offspring, the "white slave trade," housing 300,000 "fallen women," and decoying 60,000 more girls every year, or 5,000 every month, 170 every day, that is, one young life blasted every *eight* minutes! This business is patronized by over 2,000,000 "fallen men," or one boy ruined every *two* minutes" (The Light, January, 1910, p. 95).

The close connection between the traffic in liquor and the traffic in women is conceded. A manager of the latter said to the mayor of an eastern city: "Hundreds of men come into our parlors 'just to see the town,' brought there by our procurors who are paid to get these men to 'just come into the parlor.' They are men from smaller towns, with good families, and they won't disgrace wife and daughter, and unless we can get them under the influence of liquor right then and there, they won't patronize our houses; and we can't run our business without drink" (Mrs. C. Edholm).

Furthermore: "The Wholesale and Retailers' Review," a popular liquor magazine, admits: "Any man who knows the saloon well can honestly say that the most of them have forfeited their right to live. The model saloon exists chiefly in the minds of editors of liquor journals, in the imaginations of a certain type of ministers, and in the mythical stories sometimes rehearsed at saloon men's camp fires.

Unfortunately the average tippling-house is a place of ill-fame; a place of shame and debauchery. With comparatively few exceptions, our saloons are houses of drunken men, profanity and obscenity of the vilest type" (Pentecostal Herald, April 14, 1909).

The enormity of these dire evils is further seen in the yearly death of 110,000 drunkards and 60,000 "fallen women," not to mention unspeakable family sorrows and sufferings.

Now the melancholy reflection is that this appalling destruction of 170,000 human lives annually, the limitless domestic suffering and family dissolutions on the rapid increase, and the demoralizing of the public conscience threatening the welfare of the state, would be utterly impossible but for the social and political support given by the so-called Christian (?) communities! Only by their combined votes is the liquor power kept in office, ostensibly for the sake of national and municipal revenue. But it discloses a deplorable condition of civic and personal morals.

Such is the general corruption, both political and religious, that the only hope for sound ethics is a *new Christianity*. There seems occasion for Dr. Strong's statement: "Only one-half of Christ's gospel has been preached; and Christianity has been only one-half accepted, only one-half applied" (Next Great Awakening, p. 187), and this is as true of inward experience as of outward conduct. The "*new Christianity*" required is that of Christ in the gospels and the epistles.

The finer distinctions of Scriptural Christian ethics are so manifestly disregarded at the present time, that the very fact of Divine authority and Divine government is becoming an open question.

A very prominent leader in philosophical and religious thought boldly avows: "We are fast displacing the entire conception of God as governor by the conception of God as father. And the conception of the Divine government is giving place to the conception of the Divine family."

That this teaching dulls the conscience and condones sin is clear in what he further says: "And sin itself as we find it among men is largely the willfulness of freedom which has not learned self-control, rather than any deliberate choice of evil!" (Studies in Christian Life, Zion's Herald, 1909).

The greatest British statesman of his time, the Hon. Wm. E. Gladstone, very truly declared: "The greatest spiritual danger at the close of the Nineteenth Century is the decay of the sense of sinfulness." And this evidently denotes a decline of faith in the *personal* God and His righteous government as revealed in the Sacred Scriptures.

Likewise the British ambassador at Washington (1910 A.D.), the Hon. James Bryce, at the Student Volunteer Convention in Rochester, N. Y., December 29, 1909, declared: "The greatest obstacle to the spread of the Gospel abroad is its imperfect power at home. *There is a great difference between the New Testament standard and the efforts we make to reach it.*"

For deeper conviction of the spiritual lack in present ethical standards, further testimony is given. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in its Bishop's address [1896], declared: "It cannot be too deeply impressed upon our minds that in all ages the church has fallen far short of the divine ideal, both in purity and power. God's thought and plans for His Church are as high above ours as the heavens are above the earth. . . .

When we look at His ideal, promise, provision, and power, at the humiliation and exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ, at the unwordable groanings of the Holy Spirit, it seems as if *provision* and *performance* were scarcely at all related."

And the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at its recent session [May, 1910] declared: "Great as have been the successes of the Church, we lament that they have not been greater. We have not put forth half our strength." A sad confession, this, in the face of God's requirement, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with *all thy heart*, and with *all thy soul*, and with *all thy mind*" (Matt. 22:37).

These two leading bodies of Methodism numbering a membership of about 5,000,000 with about 18,000,000 of adherents, by their humiliating confessions call in question their fitness for further moral leadership.

And other denominations, for most part, give no better showing,—a legitimate inference from the fact that "leading Protestant thinkers declare that, 'Methodism holds the future; if Methodism fails, America fails.'" To the same effect is the statement of a foremost prelate of Roman Catholicism, the late Bishop Spaulding: "The only sect that Roman Catholicism fears is organized Methodism . . . I greatly fear the influence of Methodism upon the second and third generations of imported Romanists" (Gen. Conf., Methodist Episcopal Church, South, May, 1910).

If these two Methodisms, constituting so superior religions influence as is affirmed by Protestant and by Papal authorities, fall so far short of the general conception of Christian ethics, what must be their moral state in the light of the New Testament standard?

And the vast multitudes that crowd the places of Sunday amusement, to the neglect of the churches, put beyond question that the church has lost its moral leadership. And its moral degradation is seen in its fruitless efforts to regain that forfeited leadership, such as popular lectures, moving picture shows, orchestra, brass band, boys' brigade, the institutional church with its gymnasium, billiards and bowling alley, the baseball club, the "serving lunches to awaken interest in the weekly prayer meeting," the "Sunday evening lunch to induce members of the congregation to attend church," and lowest of all, the "prize-fight by two deacons!"

A vicar, to gain the masses, "gave twelve concerts, twenty dances, six lectures, three Christmas trees, a few sociables with theatricals and several outings"; and having gained "one convert," he "concluded to try the simplicity of the gospel!"

Were the foregoing schemes not basely wicked, they would constitute a ludicrous farce.

Is there not much truth in the statement of a prominent secular journal: "The time has come when the churchman must cater to the world instead of controlling it . . . The pulpit no longer is the educator, not even the censor; but has become the caterer to a very large degree—and in this sense the policy of churches has become a matter of discussion in which public opinion decides."

But why should the church quail before the world? In what is her lack of power to withstand the world-forces which make for evil? It is because Divine leadership is absent. The Divine equipment is wanting.

The question is one of moral might. Innocence is not enough. "Innocence may be founded on ig-



norance; but virtue is evermore based upon knowledge. In the presence of temptation one is a rope of sand and the other is a keen Damascus blade" (Frances E. Willard). The Divine command is, "Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might. Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil, etc." (Eph. 6:10-18). Nothing less will do.

Fragmentary good is a failure. The gospel of Christ is intolerant of fragments from start to finish. First, in doing away sin and self—"Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple" (Luke 14:33). "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me" (Matt. 16:24). "Deny"—set at naught, disown himself—his own personality, even unto death; "take up his cross"—going to crucifixion; "renounce himself fully, in all respects perseveringly" (Adam Clarke). Genuine repentance involves giving up one's natural life for Christ, fully and perseveringly in all respects. "The spirit of Christ is the spirit of martyrdom" (D. D. Whedon).

Secondly, in constructive righteousness fragments are disallowed. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matt. 5:48); "This is my commandment that ye love one another as I have loved you" (John 15:12); "Hereby know we love, because He laid down His life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren" R. V. (1 John 3:16); "Like as He who called you is holy, be ye yourselves also holy in all manner of living" R. V. (1 Pet. 1:15); "That ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing," etc. (Col. 1:10); "That ye would walk worthy

of God who hath called you unto His kingdom and glory" (1 Thess. 2:12).

Completeness in constructive righteousness is so transcendent in importance that different orders were established in the church to secure it: "And he gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers. For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. Till we all come into the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph. 4:11-13). This only avoids the sole alternative of being "children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine" (Ver. 14).

Not only was the church organized to bring believers unto perfection; but the Sacred Scriptures were given also for this purpose; "for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work" (2 Tim. 3:16, 17).

Inspired prayers specify this perfection. Paul prayed that the church at Ephesus might be strengthened according to the riches of God's glory, that Christ might dwell in their hearts imparting all the fullness of God (Eph. 3:16-19). And Christ prayed that all who believe on Him should be perfected into one with Himself and the Father even as He and the Father are one" (John 17:21-23).

This perfection was the special aim in the death of Christ (Rom. 8:3, 4; 1 John 1:7); "He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him" (Heb. 7:25). On this text the eminent Lutheran exegete, Dr. F. Delitzsch, comments,



"Christ is able to save perfectly and to the very end, but without necessarily any reference to time. He is able to save in every way, in all respects, and unto the uttermost, so that every want and every need in all its breadth and depth is utterly done away. This salvation is vouchsafed to those who through Him approach to God."

There is provision in the Atonement of Christ for the complete elimination of all fragmentariness of every sort. Men falter at God's promises, and deny the possibility of this high standard of ethics, because they do not see God's provision for its actual realization. Neither do they see God's agency in effecting it. Men need to be "corrected and instructed" (2 Tim. 3:16) by this Scripture: "God . . . through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever and ever, Amen!" (Heb. 13:20, 21). We unite with God, the efficient cause.

How true is the statement of that eminent Lutheran Ethicist, Dr. A. Wuttke: "The moral goal of every human being is moral perfection, and all that conducts thereto is for every such being an absolute duty" (Christian Ethics, Vol. II., p. 112).

Conventional ethics is self-centred, and obtains but little aid from the fragmentary, superficial Christianity of the times. Hence it is said, "The greatest happiness of all is the noblest aim of individual action, provided that happiness is compatible with the noblest and best being of the individual."

Contrary to this, *Christian* ethics is Christo-centric: "All things were created by Him and *for* Him, and He is before all things, and by Him all things

consist" (Col. 1:16, 17). "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him" (Col. 3:17).

As a basal principle and moral motive in Christian ethics, mutual good-will, or the public good, has its place; but it is not chief. Chief and foremost is God in His righteous government. This is the fundamental, forming principle and the final moral motive: "Like as He who called you is holy, be ye yourselves also holy in all manner of living; because it is written, ye shall be holy, for I am holy" R. V. (1 Peter 1:15, 16).

First in constructive order and foremost in importance is all controlling love to God as Supreme. Love to neighbor is resultant, and second in order, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the *first* and *great* commandment. And the *second* is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets" (Matt. 22:37-40).

In the ethics of Scriptural Christianity there is no alien—no foreigner; all persons are blood-kin: "God hath made of one blood all nations of men," etc. (Acts 17:26).

Every human being is "neighbor," and is to love and be loved, not with one's natural love of his species, but with the "love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us" (Rom. 5:5).

This love divinely imparted momentarily is the progressively constructive principle in the Messianic kingdom: "Seek *first* the kingdom of God and His righteousness" (Matt. 6:33). Dr. August W. Meyer rightly declares: "God calls the reader to

participate in His kingdom [i. e., the Messianic] and in His [God's] glory; for Christians are destined to enter upon the joint possession of the *dora* which God Himself has."

In proof of this is the Christian's call: "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth; whereunto He called you by our gospel [even] to the *obtaining of the glory* of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Thess. 2:13, 14). In real Christian ethics, first, fundamental, and foremost continually in order and aim, is God in "His kingdom and glory" (1 Thess. 2:12), the gospel dispensation (Luke 9:2, 6, 27; 11:20; Col. 1:13).

The growing dislike to God and His government comes of a wrong conception of His character and righteous rule. All who "are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:26) love God at once as loving Father and righteous Ruler. The right "conception of God as governor" is consistent with the right "conception of God as Father."

Whenever the "Divine family" is held to "displace the Divine government," the human will has already displaced the Divine authority of the Scriptures, as "our traditional categories of the saved and unsaved cannot be applied in any hard-and-fast manner . . . Men are not so much saved as they are becoming saved; and men are not so much lost as they are becoming lost . . . And sin itself, as we find it among men, is largely the willfulness of freedom which has not learned self-control, rather than any deliberate choice of evil."

This openly contradicts the explicit statement of Christ that men "*are* lost" (Matt. 10:6; 15:24; Luke 19:10), and sets at naught the Scriptures which declare men "*are* saved" (Luke 7:50; 1 Cor. 1:18;

Titus 3:5), and boldly denies God's declaration that the "heart of the sons of men *is fully set* in them *to do evil*" (Eccl. 8:11).

How any moral individual—not to say Christian—can read in the "dailies" constant reports of deliberately planned robberies, murders, and the atrocious deeds of lust in the "white slave trade," and yet call all this willful wickedness "largely the willfulness of freedom which has not learned self-control rather than any deliberate choice of evil," is simply astounding!

But one may become capable of this by rejecting the Divine government with its three hundred and sixty-five prohibitions and two hundred and forty-eight precepts of the Mosiac law—six hundred and thirteen in all, and by ignoring hundreds more in the New Testament, thereby forcibly verifying the words of President McCosh that "It is possible for the conscience to become a deranging instead of a regulating power" (Divine Government, p. 395).

Among ten thousand suicides annually, the following exhibits a deranged conscience: "Because of the death, three weeks ago, of——, to whom she was engaged,——, aged twenty-five, committed suicide at Niagara Falls yesterday . . . On the bank was found a handbag and in it this note—'Mama and papa, may you both forgive me for bringing this awful disgrace upon you . . . Also may our Heavenly Father forgive all my sins. But I have been very good, thank God!'"

Many now through racing after wealth and worldly display, etc., are repeating the religious folly of the great evolutionist, Charles Darwin: "In my younger days I was deeply religious; but I made my mind a machine for grinding out general

laws in the physical world; and my spiritual nature atrophied," i. e., wasted away.

Perverting and wasting away of conscience may justly be regarded as on the increase. Facing the fact that "the great majority of church members know nothing about the new birth (Prof. Henry Drummond) and "even from the evangelical churches the sense of sin in large measure departs" (J. M. Buckley), and the present general silence of the pulpit and religious press respecting God's law and future retribution, one can see the need of the reprimand from Justice Brewer of The United States Supreme Court: "You ministers are making a fatal mistake in not holding forth before men, as prominently as the previous generation did, the retributive justice of God. You have fallen into a sensational habit of rhapsodizing over the love of God, and you are not appealing to that fear of future punishment which your Lord and Master made such a prominent part of His preaching. And we are seeing the effects of it in the widespread demoralization of private virtue and the corruption of public conscience throughout the land."

Judge Brewer's more recent admonition is timely: "The greatest hope for the future of the American people is the development of its conscience" (Cleveland Press, June 6, 1907).

Emphasizing the fact of the Divine *personal* indwelling as the basis of sound ethics cannot be overestimated. Only God indwelling and transforming and forthcoming (Heb. 13:21) can match the true ethical standard. "The personal God is the basis of the moral in that He as holy will is the eternal foundation and embodiment of the moral idea" (Wuttke, *Ethics*, Vol. II., p. 82).

The civic welfare and national perpetuity depend

on this. General good-will, or the public welfare, is a proper, powerful motive; but the chief, basal, forming force in Christian ethics is the personal God manifest in righteous government.

Whenever ethics recedes from God and His holy law, moral decay sets in, accomplishing ultimate ruin. A moral axiom is stated by the British historian, Mr. Froude: "A society without God in the heart of it is not permitted to exist."

Christianity heightens the standard of morals instead of lowering it in order to make it easier. It makes it easier by virtue of greatly increased ability to meet the higher standard.

The atonement by the death of Christ (Rom. 5:10; Heb. 2:9) expends its force upon man, renewing, empowering, and adjusting him to the Divine nature and government: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself" (2 Cor. 5:19); "That he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. 3:26). By virtue of the atonement, pardon of sins is an act of Divine justice as well as of mercy. These Scriptures prove this.

The atonement not only frees man from the guilt and acts of sin and from the polluting sin-tendency in transmitted human nature, but it also empowers him to obey God, thus putting the believer upon the plane of God's moral law: "God sending forth His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin [sin-offering] condemned sin in the flesh, that the *righteousness of the law* [moral] *might be fulfilled in us*, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. 8:3, 4).

In this way man is restored again to the harmony of the universe, which is placed before man as the motive to repentance unto salvation: "Repent ye,



for the kingdom of the heavens [Gr.] is at hand" (Matt. 3:2, 4:17). So Christ's order to the *Twelve* (Matt. 10:7) and to the *Seventy* (Luke 10:11) was to put before men the crowning motive to obedience, that "the kingdom of the heavens [Gr.] is at hand" [Greek aorist—*instantly approached*].

The harmony of the universe is at once the model and the motive for human harmony. Both are based on the atonement: "Having made peace through the blood of His cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself; by Him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in the heavens" [Gr.] (Col. 1:20). Truly "He is before all things, and by Him all things consist" (Col. 1:17). On this text John Wesley notes: "He is the cement as well as support of the universe."

The universe, like the gospel, is Christo-centric. All things physical and spiritual, visible and invisible, are destined to move in harmony under control of a common centre, Christ Jesus the Lord.

This harmonious Christo-centric government of the universe given in the New Testament won from skepticism the Swiss historian, Johann Von Mueller. He confesses: "The gospel is the perfection of all philosophy, the key to all the seeming contradictions of the physical and moral world. Since I have known the Savior everything is clear."

Sin is not a part of the creative cosmic order. It is an intrusion, disturbing the harmony of the universe. It makes the individual abnormal. It takes him out of his normal element—God; and, like a fish out of water, he must perish.

Viewing the atonement in its relation to the Divine government affords to man the only rational theodicy, and the only satisfaction of his needs for

time and eternity. Here only is found the true basis of sound ethics.

Christ came to *do away* sin, and restore man to normal relations with God. His forerunner cried, "Behold the Lamb of God, which *taketh away* the sin of the world" (John 1:29); "He was manifested to *take away* our sins" (1 John 3:5).

Sin in its two-fold nature—dwelling in human nature (Rom. 7:20) and outgoing in human action (1 John 3:8) is completely eliminated. "Our old man was crucified with Him [Christ], that the body of sin might be done away" R. V. (Rom. 6:6). "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God" (Rom. 3:24, 25).

The atonement that *does away* the inward tendency and the outward act of sin, is likewise a bar against all future sin: "Now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life" (Rom. 6:22); "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed (1. Pet. 1:22, 23) remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God" (1 John 3:9).

Thus the atonement personally operative creates and constitutes Christian ethics.

Clearly shown in the foregoing Scriptures, God is the standard for character (Matt. 5:48; 1 Pet. 1:15, 16); and for conduct Christ is the pattern (Phil. 2:5; Col. 1:10; 1 Pet. 2:21; 1 John 2:6). Anything lower than this may be conventional ethics; but only this is *Christian* ethics.



## CHAPTER V.

## ETHICS AND CHRIST.

The soul of Christian ethics is Christ in His Divine personality. That Christ is the example for Christian living, is generally allowed; yet many things are done by so-called Christians which they themselves would think quite out of place in Christ.

To be made in character as good as Christ, and in conduct as consistent as Christ, is deemed impossible. So that Christ, being our example is accepted only in a loose, accommodating sense.

The sinner cannot come into sameness of character with Christ by imitation or by moral training. He is spiritually dead (Eph. 2:1); and you cannot train a dead person. God must first make him alive: "God . . . when we were dead by our trespasses, quickened [made alive, Gr.] us together with Christ" (Eph. 2:5).

Any good work in order to salvation is out of the question: "Not of works, lest any man should boast; for we are His workmanship *created* in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath foreordained that we should walk in them" (Eph. 2:9, 10). "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a *new creation* [Gr.]; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (2 Cor. 5:17).

An entirely new order is established. Out of fallen human nature, a new humanity is created.

The eminent exegete, Dr. F. Godet, rightly declares on John 17:19: "Jesus created a holy humanity in His person, and the Spirit has the task and power to reproduce in us this new humanity." Like-

wise the great French divine, Edmond de Pres-sense, has truly said, "Christ did more than simply assume human nature. He became the head of a new humanity, and its representative before God" (Early Years of Christianity, p. 273).

So the great German theologian, Dr. Dorner, speaks of Christian faith "which establishes a new mode of existence and consciousness, namely, that of the children of God (Glaubenslehre, I., p. 128).

By the fall in Eden no one now is under disadvantage. But, in spite of the fall, in Christ the race is promoted to great advantage; for "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound" (Rom. 5:20).

The Methodist theologian for a hundred years, *Richard Watson*, very truly declares: "It is impossible to impeach the equity of the Divine procedure, since *no man suffers any loss or injury ultimately by the sin of Adam*, but by his own wilful obstinacy,—the abounding grace of Christ having placed before all men, upon their believing, not merely compensation for the loss and injury sustained by Adam, but infinitely higher blessing both in kind and degree than were forfeited in him" (Theolog. Institute, Vol. II., p. 57).

But contrary to this, the general conviction is that we all *do* suffer loss, that we *are* under great disadvantage by reason of Adam sinning and transmitting to posterity sinful nature [Rom. 7:20; 8:3] and infirmities of mind and body.

Such is human experience beyond question. But one thing else is true beyond question; namely, Christ is not accepted to dwell *in* us, much less do we also dwell *in Him*, according to the gospel (John 17:21-23). It is only as we are in Him that we are the "new creation" (2 Cor. 5:17).

Christian believers of the more spiritual type, with rare exceptions, have not the personal Christ-consciousness and the personal God-consciousness. Their knowledge is that of inference. Repentance unto God with faith in Christ has brought them salvation from sin, witnessed by the Holy Spirit. And the fact of the personal God and personal Christ, is the necessary *inference*. But this knowledge by *direct intuition*, as Christ knows the Father, is *rare* indeed even among the most devout followers of Christ. In fact, this experience is generally regarded as fanaticism.

But this objection simply discloses the general ignorance of real Gospel Christianity; for Christ plainly declares of His sheep, "I know mine own and Mine own know Me, even as the Father knoweth Me, and I know the Father" R. V. (John 10:15).

The knowledge between Christ and His own is the same in nature as that between the Father and Christ. The spiritual exegete, Dr. F. Godet, on this text, says: "This knowledge is reciprocal. They [Christ and His sheep] thus live in the untroubled light of a perfect mutual knowledge . . . The conjunctive, even as [*kathos*—according as] does not express a simple comparison as *hosper* [as] would do; but it indicates that the Christian's love is of the same nature as that which unites Christ with God. It is as if the luminous medium in which the heart of the Son and the heart of the Father meet each other, were enlarged so as to become that in which the heart of Jesus and His sheep meet each other."

This union with Christ is expressed by Dr. A. W. Meyer on John 17:20 as follows: "This ethical unity of all believers, to be specifically Christian, must correspond as to its original type [*kathos*] to

the reciprocal fellowship between the Father and the Son (according to which the Father lives and moves in the Son, and the Son in the Father)."

All this lies beyond the spiritual horizon of our conventional Christianity. It is because, as Bishop Phillips Brooks says, "The idea of rescue has monopolized our religion."

Indeed, but few people see in Christianity more than deliverance from sin and consequent hell, and final admittance into heaven, where there is no sin. And, actually, the vast majority of professed Christians do not believe it possible to be freed from sin in this life. With them, heaven alone gives salvation and security from sin. In this they substitute heaven in place of Christ.

This fragmentary view of the gospel is the chief hindrance to its success. In order to gospelize the nations (Matt. 28:19) the religious community must first be saved from doubt and skepticism concerning the gospel.

The sameness and oneness of believers with Christ and the Father, indicated in the foregoing Scriptures, is the present duty superseding all other obligations. The world's belief in Christ is conditioned on it.

Nothing else has Christ made plainer: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one even as we are one; I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one, that the world may know that thou didst send

me, and lovest them even as thou lovest me" R. V. (John 17:21-23).

What Christ has given us, we are obligated to accept. His glory [Ver. 22] has been given to effect this oneness with Christ and God. This implies the *personal* presence of Christ and of God the Father.

On this point there is much confusion. Careless use of terms and lack of close attention to Christ's own words will account for this. His gracious gifts are taken for His personality. But Christ keeps the distinction between the two always clear.

He said to His disciples, "Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you" (John 14:27). Also "Continue ye in my love: If ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in His love" (John 15:9, 10). "These things have I spoken unto you that my joy might remain in you" (John 15:11).

Christ's peace, love, and joy here mentioned and Christ, are not identical; yet many think that because they have these, they have Christ Himself.

Peace is not Christ; neither is love nor joy Christ. Christ is a *Divine Person*. His presence within is self-evidencing. His personal presence within the adult Christian is attested by consciousness as clearly as His personal presence incarnate at Jerusalem was attested by the outward senses of His disciples.

This is essential Christianity. The Bampton Lectures declare rightly: "Christianity is non-existent apart from Christ; it centres in Christ, radiates now as at first from Christ" (Lord's Divinity, p. 127).

From the Scripture standpoint, salvation from sin and Christianity are not one and the same. One

may be freed from sin, as were the Old Testament saints enrolled in the Eleventh Chapter of Hebrews, and yet not be a Christian—one conscious of the personality of Christ and of God, as John speaks, "Truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ" (1 John 1:3).

This manifestation of Christ in the Christian believer's consciousness was foretold by Christ: "I will come to you"; "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and *will manifest myself to him*" (John 14:18-21); "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and *we will come unto him, and make our abode with him*" (John 14:23).

This presence is continuous, therefore it cannot refer to His appearing to the disciples after His resurrection. It must mean His personal presence revealed by the Holy Spirit.

Brown and Fausset rightly declare: "By the coming of the Spirit the presence of Christ was not only *continued* to His spiritually enlightened disciples, but rendered far more efficacious and blissful than His bodily presence had been before the Spirit's coming" (Commentary, p. 83).

Dr. Adam Clarke comments on "abode with Him"—"will make His heart our temple where God the Father, Son and Spirit shall rest, receive homage, and dwell to eternity. Thus will *I manifest myself* to the believing, obedient disciple" (Commentary, Vol. V., p. 624). Dr. D. D. Whedon comments, "Here doubtless is a *coming* which is not bodily but spiritual." . . . "The coming of the present verse is not the bodily coming of the final day, but inasmuch as the Spirit is the Spirit of



Christ, so Christ is present both in His own Spirit as Son of God, and in His representative, the Holy Spirit." . . . "This manifestation of Christ to the soul is self-evidencing. There may be false imaginations just as there may be dreams; but these false imaginations can no more invalidate or destroy the certainty of that manifestation, than dreams can destroy the certainty of any reality viewed by our waking senses. He who does not recognize from his own inner feelings what this manifestation is, stands in great need of a deeper religious experience" (Comment., Vol. II., p. 361.)

Dr. August Wilhelm Meyer, styled the "prince of exegetes," says on this Scripture: "In the mission of the Spirit, the self-communication of the exalted Christ takes place."

The spiritual censor of theology in John Wesley's time, the Rev. John Fletcher, Vicar of Madeley, asserts on this point, that Mr. Wesley "clearly distinguished *Christian* faith, properly so-called, or faith in Christ glorified, not only from the faith of a heathen, but also from the faith of initial Christianity" (Works, Vol. I., p. 589). Furthermore he says, "The apostles and other disciples, by the Holy Ghost, were made partakers of Christ glorified, either on Pentecost or after it" (Works, Vol. I., p. 592). Mr. Fletcher further declares: "The holiness and happiness of the first Christians depended on the experimental knowledge of the mystery of the Holy Trinity, or of God manifested in their souls as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" (Works, Vol. IV., p. 45).

This personal Divine indwelling is at once the cause and conservator of real Christian ethics. Paul makes it the condition of spiritual advancement: "I bow my knees unto the Father, from whom every

family in heaven and on earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, that ye may be strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inward man; that *Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith*; to the end that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, *may be strong to apprehend* with all saints what is the *breadth and length and height and depth*, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled unto all the fillings of God" R. V. (Eph. 3:14-19).

It is the ignoring of this *personal* Divine indwelling as the enabling provision and performing, that leads people to doubt or deny the duty to live the Christ life—"to walk even as he walked" (1 John 2:6); "to walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing" [pleasing God always in all things], "being fruitful in every good work and increasing unto the full knowledge of God; strengthened with all might [dynamized with all dynamite, Gr.], according to the power [*kratos*-dominion] of His glory unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness (Col. 1:10, 11).

This *epignosis* — "full knowledge" (Whedon) "perfect knowledge" (Alford) is not the limit to advancement, but a condition and instrument *for* advancement. Instance, the knowledge of forgiveness and regeneration must be perfect, before one can advance to further steps of grace: "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him" (Col. 2:6). One must be sure of faith, or he cannot add courage, etc: "To faith add courage; to courage, knowledge; to knowledge, self-control; to self-control, patience," etc. (2 Peter 1:3-8). "Each preceding grace leads to the following; each



following tempers and perfects the preceding" (Wesley).

From the customary viewpoint of sin, such perfection of character ennobling one's entire personality is not possible; but, from the standpoint of God-provided grace, man is enabled and obligated to become like God: "*Like as He* who called you is holy, be ye yourselves also holy in all manner of living: because it is written, 'Ye shall be holy; for I am holy,' " R. V. (1 Peter 1:15-16).

Very rightly Dr. Adolf Wuttke declares: "The moral goal of every human being is moral perfection; and all that conduces thereto is for every such being an absolute duty, that is, it is God's will and law concerning him" (Christian Ethics, Vol. II., p. 112).

As already indicated, the Divine provision and procedure, to reach this goal of complete likeness to God in both character and conduct, involves the Holy Trinity. And this is the condition and covenant of Christian baptism (Matt. 28:19).

The Christian disciple, or convert, is not baptized into pardon of sins or purity from "sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3) nor into any gift or work of grace, but into the *triune personality* of God. Constructive righteousness in God so far excels the destruction of sin, that sin is not even named in the baptismal bond (Matt. 28:19).

Circumcision under "The Law and Prophets" disposed of the sin question. And "The Law and Prophets" were until John: "since that time the kingdom of God is preached" (Luke 16:16). That this kingdom of God is the gospel dispensation—Christianity, Christ puts beyond question. He sent the Twelve "to preach the kingdom of God" . . . "And they departed, and went through the towns

preaching the gospel" (Luke 9:2, 6). Therefore the gospel, or Christianity, is the kingdom of God.

Respecting circumcision the eminent theologian of all Methodism for a century, *Richard Watson*, declares: "Circumcision held out the promise of justification by faith alone to every truly penitent offender. It went further, and was a sign of sanctification, or the taking away of the pollution of sin, as well as the pardon of actual offences, and thus was the visible emblem of a regenerate mind and a renewed life. This will appear from the following passages: "For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God" (Rom. 2:28, 29). "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live" (Deut. 30:6) (Theolog. Institutes, Vol. II., p. 626).

While circumcision denotes the removal of all sin, Christian baptism indicates devotement to the Holy Trinity (Matt. 28:19). That is destructive; this is constructive. That denotes the removal of obstructions to building; this indicates the building itself (Rom. 2:29; Col. 2:11, 12).

Christian baptism is so *intensely constructive* as to the persons in the Trinity, that sin is not even mentioned in any way in the Lord's commission to disciple the nations (Matt. 28:19, 20).

So significant is this, that the great exegete, Dr. August W. Meyer, boldly declares: "The Trinity is the point in which all Christian ideas and interests unite: at once the beginning and end of all

insight into Christianity" (Lehre von Trinitaet, I., b. 42).

In like manner the eminent Presbyterian theologian, Dr. C. Hodge, declares: "The Trinity determines the religious experience of believers" (Systematic Theology, Vol. I., p. 422).

The Holy Trinity is not an inscrutable mystery to puzzle or confuse the mind, but a discriminating Power shaping and conserving *Christian* experience and *Christian* ethics. Accordingly, John Wesley, greatest personality of the Eighteenth Century (Dean Stanley) declares: "The knowledge of the Three-One God is interwoven with all true Christian faith . . . I do not say that every real Christian can say with the Marquis de Renty, 'I bear about with me continually an experimental verity and a plenitude of the presence of the ever blessed Trinity.' I apprehend *this is not the experience of 'babes,'* but rather *'fathers' in Christ*" (Sermons, Vol. II., p. 24). To the same effect, Dr. Adam Clarke and Dr. D. D Whedon on John 14:23.

The noted Dr John Owen [1657 A.D.] declares: "The saints have distinct communion with the Father and the Sonne with the Holy Spirit (that is, distinctively with the Father and distinctively with the Sonne and distinctively with the Holy Spirit)"—(Owen on Spiritual Communion, p. 7).

The celebrated polemic of early Methodism, John Fletcher, Vicar of Madeley, seeing the intimate relation of the sacred Trinity to Christian ethics, aptly observes that "Christian virtues flourish or decay in proportion as the doctrine of the Trinity is rendered clear, or obscure among men" (Fletcher's Works, Vol. IV., p. 46).

It is of vital importance that we recognize the Scriptural distinction between a child of God and a

Christian. All the great exegetes, A. W. Meyer, F. Godet, John Wesley, Adam Clarke, John Fletcher, Richard Watson, D. D. Whedon, observe it. In this they follow Christ (Matt. 11:11-13; 22:36-40; Luke 16:16), and the Apostle Paul (Acts 28:23; 2 Cor. 3:7-18; Heb. 8:10; 9:8; 10:1-29).

And not, with Paul, to follow Christ in distinguishing the Mosaic dispensation with its destruction of sin and restoration to God's favor and family, from Christianity with its constructive kingdom of the heavens [Gr.] administered by God manifested within the believer as Father, Son and Holy Spirit,—not to distinguish between Moses and Christ, is to obscure the transcending glory of the gospel (2 Cor. 3:10-18; Matt. 11:11-13), weaken the Church before the world, and spread confusion throughout Christian ethics.

As we have already seen, Christian ethics can be known and accomplished only by Christ personally dwelling in the Christian believer and, with his co-operation, accomplishing, or doing, Christian ethics.

Paul testifies this concerning his ministry: "It pleased God . . . to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the heathen" (Gal. 1:16). He says the same concerning his daily living: "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer that I live, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself up for me" R. V. (Gal. 2:20).

This conscious indwelling of the personal Christ is not optional with the genuine Christian. It is a matter of promise and of prayer on the part of Christ, consequently a matter of obligation on part of the Christian: "At that day ye shall know that

I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, loveth me; and I will love him and *will manifest myself to him*" . . . If a man love Me he will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (John 14:20-23).

For this personal indwelling, Christ prayed: "And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: *I in them*, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them even as thou lovedst me" R. V. (John 17:22, 23).

This personal Divine indwelling is for all Christian believers through all time: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word" (John 17:20). Accordingly Paul observes: "My little children, of whom I travail in birth until *Christ be formed in you*" (Gal. 4:19; "The riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is *Christ in you*, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27).

As Paul prayed that the churches of Gallatia and Colosse might know this indwelling of Christ, likewise he prays for the Church at Ephesus: "I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . That He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man; that *Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith*," etc. (Eph. 3:14-17).

In this prayer and in that of Christ (John 17: 9-23) gospel grace comes to climax. The deep-seeing John Fletcher declares with truth: "This spiritual abode of Christ in the souls of His people is the most glorious mystery of the gospel" (Fletch-

er's Works, Vol. III., p. 196). Mr. Fletcher adds, "We have to lament that this important part of the gospel is so rarely published among professing Christians. The greater part of the clergy are to be ranked as the most violent opposers of spiritual religion." . . . "All our ecclesiastics, however, are not of this description. Among the thousands of this sacred order we find many who are possessed of godly fear, etc. . . . "They preach the cross of Christ; but they proclaim not the spiritual coming of a risen Savior" (Fletcher's Works, Vol. III., p. 146).

This admonition of one hundred and fifty years ago has present application. In this day this doctrine is not preached, save with very rare exceptions.

We are not seeing present responsibility as Mr. Fletcher saw it a century and a half ago. He said: "To reject the Son of God manifested in the Spirit, as worldly Christians are universally observed to do, is a crime of equal magnitude with that of the Jews who rejected Christ manifest in the flesh" (Fletcher's Works, Vol. III., p. 181).

This subject to most people seems difficult of apprehension. In fact it lies beyond their spiritual horizon. Some regard it as hyperorthodoxy; others, as heterodoxy. And some brand it as dangerous fanaticism.

Lack of apprehension on this point has its cause or causes. First, is the want of information. But rarely is this subject taught in pulpit or press. Secondly, deteriorated moral vision inducing spiritual insensibility (2 Peter 1:9), is a very common cause. The eminent naturalist, Charles Darwin, confesses this malady: "In my younger days I was deeply religious; but I made my mind a machine for grind-



ing out general laws in the material world, and my spiritual nature atrophied," i. e., wasted away. A third cause of this lack of apprehension is the attempt to discern it with the intellect, whereas spiritual things are "spiritually discerned"; the natural—psychic—man "cannot know them" (1 Cor. 2:14). By the natural faculties "things of the Spirit of God cannot be discovered, but "God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2:10).

To accomplish this, the Spirit Himself is sent to be accepted by faith (Gal. 3:2, 14). He was promised by the Father (Luke 24:49) and also by the Son (John 14:26; 16:7-15). And Christ commanded His apostles "that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father" (Acts 1:4). His coming into them (Acts 2:4) gave them power to be witnesses unto Him. Apart from *this* enduement of power, all knowledge of Christ is simply inferential, not immediate and personal; for "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:3).

The spiritual John Fletcher rightly declares: "Without this Spirit, we must continue strangers to the most exalted truths of the gospel, and be cut off from the purest springs of religious consolation (Fletcher's Works, Vol. III., p. 196). In other words, we must continue strangers to real Christianity, both as to experience and ethics.

Christianity is essentially more than freedom from sin and perfect love accomplished under the "Law and Prophets" (Matt. 22: 36-40). Accordingly Dean Alford declares: "*The gift of the Spirit at and since the day of Pentecost was, and is, something totally distinct from anything before that*



time, a new and loftier dispensation." And this is the consensus of orthodox theologians well expressed by Dr. C. Hodge: "The Christian economy is specially the dispensation of the Spirit" (Systematic Theology, Vol. I., p. 376).

As already indicated, this dispensation of the Spirit is entered by faith (Acts 2:33; Gal. 3:2, 14). The famous polemic of John Wesley's time, John Fletcher, well declares: "The opening of this dispensation in our hearts requires, on our part, not only faith in Christ, but a peculiar faith in the promise of the Father; a promise, this, which has the Holy Spirit for its great object" (Fletcher's Works, Vol. II., p. 592).

Notwithstanding special Scriptures on this point, the concurrence of standard theologians, and the universal need of a more powerful manifestation of God, yet some have feared that teaching faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit distinctively, tends to mystify the subject of religion. But quite the contrary is true. Instead of beclouding, it clears the subject. This fact is well expressed by the Rev. John Fletcher in his letter to John Wesley: "Nothing throws down unscriptural mysticism like holding out the promise of the Father and the fullness of the Spirit to be received now by faith in the two Promisers, the Father and the Son" (Fletcher's Works, Vol. IV., p. 386).

The concurrent testimony of trustworthy witnesses to this fact is voiced by John Wesley's model saint, the Marquis de Renty: "I bear in me ordinarily an experimental verity and plenitude of the most Holy Trinity, *which elevates me to a simple view of God.*"

President Jonathan Edwards [Presbyterian] testifies: "I have many times had a sense of the glory

of the Third Person in the Trinity, in His office of sanctifier; in His holy operation *communicating divine light and life* to the soul" (Edwards' Works, Vol. I., p. 133).

On the importance of obtaining the Holy Spirit, President Edwards says: "The state of the times extremely requires a fullness of the Divine Spirit in ministers, and we ought to give ourselves no rest until we have obtained it. And in order to do this, I should think that ministers, above all persons, ought to be in secret prayer and fasting, and also much in prayer and fasting with one another. It seems to me it would be becoming the circumstances of the present day, if ministers in a neighborhood would often meet together and spend days in fasting and fervent prayer among themselves" (President Edwards on Revivals, p. 414).

President Edwards held that Pentecost was not a pattern-day for the future, but simply the inauguration of Christianity: "That was only, as it were, a feast of first-fruits; the ingathering is at the end of the year, or in the last ages of the Christian church as represented in Rev. 14: 14-16, and will probably as much exceed what was in the first ages of the Christian Church . . . as that exceeded all that had been before under the Old Testament, confined only to the land of Judea" (Edwards on Revivals, p. 198).

John Wesley's chosen polemic, the Rev. John Fletcher, Vicar of Madeley, held the same views, and insisted that "the day of Pentecost was the opening of the dispensation of the Spirit—the great promise of the Father; and that the latter-day glory which he believed was near at hand, should far exceed the first effusion of the Spirit" (Tyerman's Life of Fletcher, p. 468).

With this high ideal before them the churches, instead of depending on the pastor or the evangelist, were taught to depend, with their ministers, solely on God. As a consequence, under the awakening Spirit of God falling upon them, people often cried out or fell prostrate while the minister was preaching.

These manifestations were frequent in the "Great Awakening" under President Jonathan Edwards, and they were quite common in the "Great Reformation" under John Wesley and his associates and their immediate successors.

These two movements revealed Christianity in its highest life and purest morals in modern times. Prayer, secret, social and persistent, gave these religious movements their rise and progress, thus illustrating the truth stated by the eminent Lutheran ethicist, Dr. Adolf Wuttke: "Prayer is the highest moral act; and all other moral action receives its moral worth solely from its relation to this" (Christian Ethics, Vol. II., p. 221).

Another prominent witness to special clearness in personal experience and in doctrine in consequence of the personal indwelling of Christ, is Lady Maxwell. Like the Marquis de Renty, she testifies to clearness of spiritual views as a result: "My fellowship with the Father and Son is more intimate and uninterrupted. I am enabled to realize their presence wherever I am. My meditations are delightful, *my views clear*," etc. (Life of Lady Maxwell, p. 131). Still further: "I see how much I stand in need of sinking deeper in His love, and more free from wanderings" (Life of Lady Maxwell, p. 135). "I was favored with a clear view of the Trinity, which I never had before, and enjoyed fellowship with a triune God" . . . "Hitherto

I have been led to view the Holy Ghost chiefly as an agent; now I behold Him distinctly as the Third Person of the Trinity" (Life of Lady Maxwell, p. 258).

The evangelistic power attending this conscious personal indwelling of the sacred Trinity was phenomenal: "At many of our preaching places, we cannot meet the classes on account of the cries of the distressed. Sometimes fifty in a day are truly converted to the living God . . . At two quarterly meetings during these four days there were between two and three hundred savingly brought to God" . . . "Such a sight I never beheld before. The penitents lay in rows on the ground, crying for mercy at the hand of God; many of whom were the principal gentry of the country" (Life of Lady Maxwell, p. 269).

Concerning her personal experience, Lady Maxwell writes: "On Thursday, the 14th, 1793, He condescended to give me a sweet manifestation of the Holy Trinity, and a *very clear perception of the personality* of the Holy Spirit (Life of Lady Maxwell, p. 316). . . . "A full union with Deity, that is my privilege and His will concerning me" . . . "In short, it felt the *most simple* and also the most pure state of enjoyment that language can describe; O, to feel it every moment!" (Life of Lady Maxwell, p. 322). Here is explicit evidence that a clear consciousness of the *persons* in the Trinity makes clear and simple the mysteries of the gospel hitherto inscrutable.

Neither does this deeper knowledge of God tend to spiritual pride, but the contrary. "He has considerably deepened my experience, and greatly extended my prospects, though *yet I am very far short of the Christian standard*. At times I am so

led into Jehovah, permitted so to sink into Deity, as I can by no words express. My enjoyment is exquisite, but *always guarded by a sacred awe*" . . . "O, that I may be enabled fully to improve to the utmost this wonderful intercourse with Deity; aware that it is no further useful than as it *proves of an assimilating nature*" (Life of Lady Maxwell, p. 374).

Christian ethics in the *outer* life can never rise higher in moral excellence than one's *inner* life—union with God. This is self-evident. Experimentally knowing the Divine persons in Deity, instead of inducing silent mysticism within, is the only way for the full manifestation of the "fruit of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance [self-control]" (Gal. 5:22, 23).

"The spiritual manifestation of the Son of God" had in Rev. John Fletcher a powerful advocate. He estimated this "the most invaluable of all blessings," and showed forcibly in six letters filling fifty-three octavo pages, that "the Son of God manifests Himself, sooner or later, in a spiritual manner," showing that the "New Testament abounds with accounts of particular revelations of the Son of God; as, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Matt. 5:8); "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved by my Father, and I will love him, and *will manifest myself unto him*" (John 14:21); "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and *we will come unto him, and make our abode with him*" (John 14:23); "God who commanded light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light [resplendence] of the knowl-

edge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 4:6).

Such Scriptures refute the palpable error that *personal* manifestations of God were granted to the patriarchs and prophets because they did not have the written Scriptures and are now withheld from us because we do have them.

On this point John Fletcher impressively exclaims: "If because we have the letter of Scripture, we must be deprived of all immediate manifestations of Christ and His Spirit we are great losers by that blessed Book, and we might reasonably say, 'Lord bring us back to the dispensation of Moses! Thy Jewish servants could formerly converse with Thee face to face.'" . . . "The ark of the covenant went before them, and struck terror into all their adversaries; but a Book, of which our enemies make daily sport, is the only revelation of Thy power among us," etc. . . . O Lord! if because we have this blessed picture of Thee, we must have no discovery of the glorious original, have compassion on us, take back Thy precious Book, and impart Thy more precious Self to us, as Thou didst to Thy ancient people" (Life of Fletcher, Tyermann, p. 127, 128).

Our neglect at this point is no innocent oversight. It does immense harm. It is only by accepting all gracious provision that we can avoid *deception* and final overthrow: "Put on the whole armor of God that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil," etc. (Eph. 6:11-18). Short of this, no one stands.

Furthermore, if we do not accept these Scriptures foretelling and narrating the spiritual manifestations of God's personal Son in Christian believers, we must also reject the Scriptures foretelling and



narrating His physical manifestations in Judea. Those Scriptures are as plain as these; and to accept these, while we reject those, forfeits our right to public confidence. To merit confidence we must be consistent.

John Wesley was delighted with John Fletcher's clear presentation and strong defense of the "spiritual manifestation of the Son of God," and pressed it upon others.

He says of Mr. Fletcher: "It seems God has raised him up for this very thing" (Wesley's Works, Vol. VII., p. 177).

To Miss Ritchie, a witness to this experience, Mr. Wesley wrote: "Do you never lose your consciousness of the presence of the Three-One God?" Again, August 24, 1777: "Do you still find the same consciousness of the presence of the ever-blessed Trinity?" (Wesley's Works, Vol. VII., p. 181).

He wrote to Miss Jane Bisson, November 3, 1789: "Do you still find deep, uninterrupted communion with God; with the Three-One God, with the Father and the Son, through the Spirit?" (John Wesley's Works, Vol. VII., p. 210).

Three months before his death, Mr. Wesley again wrote her on November 9, 1790: "I trust you still enjoy communion with God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ. I hope you are still sensible, wherever you go, of the presence of the ever-blessed Trinity" (Wesley's Works, Vol. VII., p. 211).

To preserve and promulgate this lofty ideal, Mr. Wesley had it incorporated in their book of hymns published in 1741. In the preface the perfect Christians are described as: "Having the witness in themselves. Thou art an heir of God, a joint-heir with Christ, continually heightens the inexpressible hunger they feel after a renewal in His image



in 'righteousness and holiness.' Then God gives them a single eye and a pure heart; He stamps upon them His own image and superscription; He createth them anew in Christ Jesus; *He cometh to them with His Son and blessed Spirit, and fixing His abode in their souls*, bringeth them into the rest which remaineth for the people of God" (Wesley's Christ, Perfect., p. 38).

And in 1742 another volume of hymns was published from which we quote:

"O joyful sound of gospel grace!  
*Christ shall in me appear;*  
I, even I, shall see His face,  
I shall be holy here."

"Come, O my God, *thyself reveal,*  
Fill all this mighty void;  
Thou only canst my spirit fill,  
Come, O my God, my God!"

In 1749:

"Unfold the hidden mystery,  
The second gift impart;  
*Reveal Thy glorious self in me,*  
In every waiting heart."

Mr. Wesley regarded this distinctively personal consciousness of God as an essential in truly Christian faith: "The knowledge of the Three-One God is interwoven with all *true Christian* faith" (Sermons, Vol. II., p. 24). He held it as fundamental in the "spiritual qualifications" of a preacher; hence his admonition: "We do not sufficiently watch over each other. Should we not frequently ask each

other, 'Do you walk closely with God? *Have you now fellowship with the Father and the Son?*'" (Discipline, 1908, p. 104).

As Mr. Wesley, in letters to members of his society, pressed this question: "Have you deep uninterrupted communion with the Father and the Son through the Spirit?" so he would have his preachers press upon each other the question, "Have you now fellowship with the Father and the Son?"

This subject is given the more extended consideration because of its causal relation to Christian ethics. It is this doctrinal and conscious anchorage in the Holy Trinity (Matt. 28:19) that enabled early Methodism to vindicate its theology and gain its spiritual triumph and its moral leadership, despite *the seven hundred and twenty* volumes written against it (Prof. Bartlett).

Herein is verified the statement of President W. F. Warren, of Boston University, made four decades ago: "In Methodism we recognize the highest stage both of life and doctrine, which Christianity has as yet reached" (Systematische Theologie, 85).

Among the more recent advocates and witnesses of this threefold faith and experience are the following:

1—*Dr. Andrew Murray*: "The greatness of this salvation consists in this, that it comes to us from and through *The Triune God* . . . There is no fellowship with the Father but through the Son, and no fellowship with the Son but through the Holy Spirit in us. This is the greatness of the great salvation; in its offer the Three-One God comes to us" (Holiest of All, pp. 69, 70). "It was the Holy Spirit who, when the way had been opened, came

out from the Holiest of All on the day of Pentecost, to impart to men the life and power of the glorified Christ" (Holiest of All, p. 288).

"Entering into the Holiest (Heb. 10:19-22) is only the beginning of the Christian life" (Holiest of All, p. 389).

2—*Bishop William Taylor*, the greatest among modern witnesses, bears this testimony: "I have been accustomed to walk with God for forty-four years without a break. Sometimes I have had a special manifestation to my spirit of the Son of God, when it was my pleasure to perceive His distinct personality, and to sit in His presence and admire and adore Him, and in melting love sympathize with Him in His stupendous undertaking of bringing our lost race back to God, and feel the wish in my heart, 'Oh, that I could multiply myself into a thousand, and give a thousand years to help Jesus.

"At other times I have had a special manifestation of the personal Holy Ghost and the amazing love of the Spirit for a perishing world, and in adoring love and sympathy put myself entirely at His disposal, to illuminate and lead me according to His own infinite wisdom and love.

"But ever since I took charge of this expedition to Africa, with no less appreciation and admiration of the personal Jesus and the personal Holy Sanctifier, I have walked all these months in the manifestation of the personal presence of God the Father, with such enlarged perceptions of His wisdom, His love, His patience, and forbearance, His infinite desire to adjust the human conditions essential to the fulfillment of His covenant pledge to the Redeemer, to give Him the heathen for His inheritance, and the uttermost part of the earth for His

possession. I sit in His presence, and more and more than ever before weep in adoring love" (Divine Life, 1886, p. 246).

These eminent witnesses are trustworthy. Their rank in education, culture and spiritual insight commands the highest respect.

Then, too, the nature of their testimony makes it impossible to doubt them. It is not the testimony of the senses, as hearing and seeing, wherein one may be deceived. But it is the testimony of inner consciousness wholly independent of the external senses, and is therefore infallible. Skeptical as well as Christian philosophers concede this.

Of the former class, John Stuart Mill declares, "Whatever is known to us by consciousness is known beyond possibility of question." Of the latter class, Sir William Hamilton declares "That given in consciousness is undoubtedly true."

"Even the greatest skeptics have allowed that we must trust consciousness" (Dr. McCosh).

This evidence is not an inference from any course of reason. *It is intuitive.*

The standard for real Christian knowing is the mutual knowing of the Father and the Son of God. And this is not by inference. It is direct, immediate, *intuitive.*

Likewise the mutual knowing of Christ and the real Christian is *intuitive*—back of, and prior to all sensation and mental processes. See Christ's testimony: "I know mine own, and mine own know me even as the Father knoweth me and I know the Father" R. V. (John 10:15).

The conjunctive "*Even as*" instead of *as* [*kathos* instead of *hosper*] implies not only comparison, as *hosper* would do, but also essential conformity as to substance (Godet Meyer). The Christian's

*knowing* Christ is intrinsically identical with Christ's *knowing* the Father.

We must obtain the moral consciousness—the “*know*”—of Christ, in order to have the ethics—the morals—of Christ.

The recent sensational attempt of persons lacking Christ's purity and power, “to do for one week as Christ would do in like circumstances,” is at once unscriptural and unreasonable, if not presumptuous.

Gracious ability and moral accountability coincide. Divine provision and human performance exactly correspond in Scripture-Christianity.

Inferior estimate of enabling grace produces inferior personal experience and inferior morals. Lack of holiness in ethics denotes lack of harmony with the Divine procedure.

*Approximating* the New Testament standard is not Christian ethics. Real Christian ethics is to have ingrained in character and conduct the living personal Christ; rather it is Christ with the Father dwelling within by the Spirit, transforming and endowing, and directing the purified believer “from faith to faith” (Rom. 1:17), “from glory to glory” (2 Cor. 3:18), “unto all the fulness of God” (Eph. 3:16-19).

Man's fragmentary conception places the only limit to spiritual progress, yet he may be evermore lifting that limit “from faith to faith” (Rom. 1:17): “If ye abide in me and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you” (John 15:7); “All things are possible to him that believeth” (Mark 9:23).

Christian privilege and Christ's prerogative coincide in this instance: “If ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept

my Father's commandments and abide in His love" (John 15:10).

This is the domain of spiritual certitude. Probables and approximates are excluded; "For all the promises of God in Him are yea, and in Him, Amen, unto the Glory of God" (2 Cor. 1:20).

Lack of Bible knowledge and of obedient faith lies at the root of all discord and discontent in human society. Men know more about wickedness than about godliness. Their thinking and experience in sin far exceed their thinking and experience in godliness. The general experience is one of sinking deeper and deeper into sin and of hiding from view more and more God's infinite provision for its complete extinction and man's restoration to union with God.

The personal indwelling of the sacred Trinity shown in this chapter is the only vindication of the ethical teachings of Christ. It is the only solution of the obligation to "walk worthy of God" (2 Thess. 2:12). Only God-character can "walk worthy of God" (Heb. 13:20, 21). And only in this domain of Christian experience will be found the solution of all the burning problems of our modern civilization: "The God of peace . . . make you perfect in every good work to do His will, doing in you that which is well pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ" (Heb. 13:21); "My God shall supply *all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus*" (Phil. 4:19).

The teaching of complete salvation from sin, actual (Rom. 3:25) and indwelling (Rom. 7:20; 8:3) requires for proof the personal deliverance from all sin resulting in perfect love as granted in the "Law and Prophets" (Matt. 22:36-40; Lev. 19:2, 18, 34); Equally so, the teaching of Christianity requires

for its support the personal experience of the Sacred Trinity, which is "The beginning and the end of all insight into Christianity" (Meyer, *Lehre von Trinitaet*, 1:42). Likewise John Wesley: "The knowledge of the Three-One God is interwoven with all true Christian faith" (Sermons, Vol. II., p. 24). The reader must remember that these great exegetes distinguish between salvation from sin and Christianity. Faith for deliverance from all sin is one thing; faith for constructive holiness in the personal consciousness of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is quite another thing.

This experience is of so great import that Christ withheld His followers from further preaching (Luke 24:49), until the Holy Spirit should come and make them witnesses to Him (Acts 1:8), as He would reveal the Father also. This Christ promised to His obedient follower: "I will manifest myself to him"; "The Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him" (John 14:21, 23).

They had already been witnesses to Christ's saving and cleansing grace (John 13:10, 11; 15:3; 17:14, 16). They must now be made witnesses to *Him* in His Divine *personality*. They had been enabled to testify to facts *concerning* Him; but they must now be enabled to testify to *Himself* as now glorified (Godet, Fletcher, Meyer). To reach this equipment, all else is called off—"Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem" (Luke 24:49).

This same order was observed in Christ calling Saul of Tarsus into the Apostolate: "It pleased God . . . to reveal His Son in me that I might preach Him among the heathen" (Gal. 1:16).

From the Divine procedure in both these instances, it is quite clear that permission and equip-



ment to preach the gospel were conditioned on the *personal* Divine indwelling.

One thing more is quite evident, namely, that this is God's standard for all Christians throughout all time. Of this our Lord's prayer is proof: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word. That *they all* may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us; that *the world may believe that thou hast sent me*. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one even as we are one: I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me" (John 17:20-23).

This is confirmed by the prayer of Paul for the church at Ephesus: "That He [God] would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man, that *Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith*," etc. (Eph. 3:16-19). And, furthermore, the church was organized and officered in order to bring about this very thing in every Christian believer: "He gave some to be Apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. 4:11-13).

"The fulness of Christ" implies His maturity and completeness of moral character, fully expressing the Father, "the glory thou hast given me I have given them" (John 17:22); "God hath from the be-

ginning chosen you unto salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth: whereunto He called you by our gospel, to the *obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ*" (2 Thess. 2:13, 14); "Who *called you* unto His kingdom and *glory*" (1 Thess. 2:12).

Dr. August Wilhelm Meyer comments: "God calls the reader to participate in His kingdom [i. e., the Messianic] and in His [God's] glory; for Christians are destined to enter upon the joint possession of the *doxa* which God Himself has."

Given the gospel equipment, the gospel standard of ethics is easily lived.

## CHAPTER VI.

## INDIVIDUAL ETHICS.

Having seen the Divine provision making possible Christian ethics, we may now consider its concrete realization. This brings into prominence the individual.

Herein *Christian* ethics parts from all others, both in contents and in development.

Hindu ethics estimates the individual as a world-renouncing and self-vanishing personality. Complete self-effacement in Deity, or *nirvana*, is the acme of human bliss.

The ethics of Japan values the individual as a loyal subject of a divine dynasty. And his personal worth rises with his rank indicated by the Mikado.

In the ethics of China the individual has standing only as he is a family-subject of obedience under an unchangeable world-order. The worship of ancestors binds him to best things in the past and gives best footing for the present.

According to the ethics of ancient Greece the worth of the individual is his value to the state, founded on human slavery of barbarians or trophies in war. Attica had 400,000 slaves; Corinth, 460,000. And Sparta with 150,000 citizens had 500,000 slaves. Only the *Hellene* was a truly moral personality.

But *Christian* ethics estimates the individual as a personal expression of God. "Your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. 6:19); "Ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said: 'I will dwell in them and walk in them'" (2 Cor. 6:16). The worth of the individual is intrinsic by virtue

of the Divine union within: "As thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us" (John 17:21).

Herein is the excellency of *Christian* ethics over all others. In the scales of moral worth it tips them all. Contrary to all others, it makes the individual the unit of measurement in society instead of being ranked *by* society. And, as is this moral unit, such is the moral community; for community is the moral unit, or individual, multiplied.

No community can be better than the individuals comprising it. Ex-President Roosevelt has wisely said, "The worth of a civilization is the worth of the man at its centre. When this man lacks moral rectitude, material progress only makes bad worse, and so the problem still darkens and becomes more complex."

Christian, that is, New Testament ethics, takes full account of the entire personality from first to last. To be well-born is fundamental. Eugenics is termed a new science, but its principles are not new. It seems new to some people because their attention is now specially directed to this part of real Christianity.

The Christian Scriptures strongly safeguard human life *prenatal* as well as postnatal. But this is perfectly plain only to persons renewed in the image of God. Only such persons see man's high rank and holy mission; for "these things are spiritually discerned," hence the "natural man cannot know them" (1 Cor. 2:14).

Prenatal life is safeguarded in these Scriptures: "As children of obedience, not fashioning yourselves according to your former lusts in the time of your ignorance; but like as He who called you is holy, be ye yourselves also holy *in all manner of*

*living*" R. V. (1 Pet. 1:14, 15). "All manner of living" includes all periods, actions and conditions of human life.

"Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, but yield yourselves unto God as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God" (Rom. 6:13). Furthermore: "The body is not for fornication, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid" . . . "What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you, which ye have from God? And ye are not your own; for ye are bought with a price: glorify God, therefore, in your body" R. V. (1 Cor. 6:13, 15, 19, 20).

Every limb and organ of the body, every function of the soul, and every faculty of the mind has its divine purpose, and is sacred to the Divine service: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind" (Luke 10:27).

"Ye are not your own." One's personality is not his property. By virtue of the atonement it belongs to God; therefore, the command, "Glorify God in your body."

Throughout the entire domain of the bodily appetites God's law is: "Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:31).

#### EUGENICS.

This word means literally the science of beget-

ting well, or being well born. The eminent naturalist, F. Galton, calls it "The science of improving stock, whether human or animal."

And to be well born implies to have been well conceived and well nurtured, in order to be well born.

This principle of heredity was emphasized in the Divine command to the prospective mother of Samson, that she "drink not wine nor strong drink, and eat not any unclean thing" (Judges 13:4, 14).

The physical basis of life was hereby conserved; and the psychic was safeguarded by the command, "He shall be a Nazarite unto God from the womb" (Judges 13:5). This involved purity of thought and purity of feeling as well as goodness in conduct; for "Nazarites were purer than snow, they were whiter than milk" (Lam. 4:7).

The significance of parental physical conditions and of parental thought and feeling upon offspring has never, as yet, had a fair consideration. It may not be saying too much to question whether or not very many, if not most, people start for this world through accident or lust, rather than through reasonable and Scriptural forethought on part of the parents. This point is worthy of the most sacred and careful thought, the more so, because eminent scientists, for years, have given the most scrutinizing study to the improvement of species in the vegetable and animal kingdoms. Still more so, because the human species so far outranks and so infinitely outvalues all species in those kingdoms.

Eugenics includes as its most important factor that insoluble mystery named

#### HEREDITY.

Its methods are not known, but as a *fact*, it is

known in the "transmission of the physical and psychical qualities of parents to their offspring."

The supremacy of mind over matter is a fact manifest in heredity. But *how* this supremacy is maintained is not known. Mr. Huxley confesses: "The problem of the connection of body and soul is as insoluble in its modern form as it was in the prehistoric ages." And Professor Tyndal allows that "the passage from the physics of the brain to the corresponding facts of consciousness is unthinkable." That qualities of mind and of body are transmitted from progenitor to posterity, has long been a well established scientific fact. That thought is a strong factor herein, is evident. Especially is this manifest in the maternal relation.

It is said in the city of Florence an Italian woman of potential motherhood sat day after day and week after week admiring the beautiful tracing and the magnificent frescoes being executed by great artists upon the interior of a cathedral. And in due time she became mother of the immortal sculptor and painter *Michelangelo* [Anglicized into *Michael Angelo*].

Her thought and emotions of the beautiful were transmitted.

History states that the mother of Napoleon, before his birth, visited the battlefields, studied military tactics, reviewed troops, and experienced with her husband the life of a soldier. Her military thought and experience gave character to her son. To verify both of these events, consult "Law of Mentalism," p. 45.

Criminal qualities are likewise transmitted from parent to posterity.

"The mother of President Garfield's assassin, Guiteau, unsuccessfully attempted to produce an



abortion by taking drugs." . . . "The child was stamped with the disposition to murder before he ever saw the light of day" (The Way of God in Marriage, p. 139).

"The mother of little Jesse Pomeroy used to sit at her work and watch her husband, who was a butcher, kill cattle, sheep and hogs, while she carried little Jesse under her heart. The natural result was a human monster who, when twelve years of age, had killed some five or six children; and at the age of thirteen was sent to the state penitentiary for life. The prisoners felt sorry for the boy, and gained permission from the warden to allow the child to have a pet kitten in his cell part of the time. But the very first night he had the kitten with him in his cell, he killed it. When asked by the warden why he did so, he replied, 'I don't know; I just can't help it.' He was born a murderer, the disposition being formed before his birth" (Way of God in Marriage, p. 144).

"A woman of criminal tendencies, who died in 1827, had given birth to several children, all of whom inherited her criminal traits. By following the records of her offspring from generation to generation, it has been found that, up to May, 1902, no less than *seven hundred* of them had been convicted of criminal offenses, and that *thirty-seven* had been *executed for committing murder*. The offspring of this one woman had, up to that date, cost the government about three million dollars for court trials and executions.

"And all this crime with costs resulted from one woman's thoughts" [multiplied in her offspring]!! (Law of Mentalism, p. 134).

"Dr. E. Harris observes concerning 'Margaret, the mother of criminals,' and her offspring, that

"The county records show that two hundred of her descendants were criminals. In one generation of her unhappy line there were twenty children, of whom seventeen lived to maturity. Nine served terms aggregating fifty years in state prisons, for high crimes; and all the others were frequent inmates of jails and almshouses. It is said of the six hundred and twenty-three descendants of this out-cast girl, two hundred committed crimes which brought them upon the court records; and most of the others were idiots, drunkards, lunatics, paupers, or prostitutes. The cost to the county, of this race of criminals and paupers, is estimated at one hundred thousand dollars'" (D. R. Miller, D. D., "Criminal Classes, Causes and Cures," p. 131).

I must add one more instance, that of transmitted skepticism: "Some years since, a minister of the gospel, who swayed audiences with his eloquence, preached love, purity and the Golden Rule, while his home life was almost unendurable to the rest of his household. He was tyrannical and overbearing to such a degree that his wife became exceedingly skeptical. At one time, during the gestation period, the husband seemed worse than ever; and the poor wife had about concluded that there was no reality to Christianity, and almost doubted the existence of God. And as a result she gave to the world a child, although endowed with many excellent and superior qualities, one possessed of unusual oratory and a great heart, yet one of the most pronounced skeptics of modern years, Robert G. Ingersoll. And who, do you think, was to blame for that spirit of skepticism? I answer without hesitation, that husband and father" (Way of God in Marriage, p. 141).

In like manner high moral and religious charac-

ter is transmitted: "For about two hundred years 1,400 descendants of President Jonathan Edwards have been traced. A large per cent. of each generation have filled prominent positions as lawyers, physicians, teachers, ministers, reformers, authors, soldiers, public officials and captains of industry" (The Light, p. 50, September, 1911).

Jonathan Edwards' father was a minister; his mother, the daughter of one. Among their offspring are counted "over three hundred college graduates; over one hundred college professors; one hundred ministers, missionaries and theological professors; one hundred lawyers, thirty judges; sixty physicians and sixty authors."

The start and growth of offspring will always be according to the psychic and moral qualities in the parents and according to environment. And by parents here is meant present and remote progenitors; for it is known that ancestral qualities lie dormant during one or more generations, and then appear again.

That prince among horticulturists, *Luther Burbank*, by obeying the laws of heredity in plants and fruits has produced improvements bordering upon the miraculous.

Celebrated scientists and eminent stock farmers in Europe and America have made like improvements in horses, cattle, poultry, etc. "Thoroughbreds" and all other high class animals are registered on their pedigree and pure ancestry.

A noted dog-fancier was enthusiastically dilating upon his canine achievements, to his guest, a profound student in eugenics, and spreading out a chart he continued, "Now, this is the 'Duke of Argyle'; this one the 'Duke of Wellington'; this one 'Gladstone'; this 'Lord Chesterfield,'" and so on to

the end of the list. "Now, I have to show a pedigree and a clear ancestry for five generations back, before I can have them registered." And, with a look of supreme satisfaction, he continued, "And my dogs are all registered."

His guest observes, "Now, all the time that man was talking, I was thinking, not of what he was saying, but of his two little still-born babes which had been laid sorrowfully out of sight. Plenty of dogs, but not a child in the home. I thought, 'race-suicide,—but dog-multiplication.' And I could not refrain from saying, 'Brother, don't you think that if good men gave as much consideration to the procreation of human souls, as they do to the lower orders of life, that there would be fewer nails driven in the little white coffins?' 'Oh, I suppose so,' was his evasive reply" (*The Way of God in Marriage*, p. 137).

That evasive reply indicates the criminal indifference to the natural laws of parenthood and the welfare of human offspring. And this truly almost universal indifference should stir and fire every friend of the race with a feeling of the tremendous responsibility involved. And the general lack of early and later childhood instruction as to the lofty mission and the sacred trust of human life, including the end and sphere of the overruling sexual powers, becomes now a menace to the public good and to the perpetuity of the state. On the design of the sexual functions, the words of President Mark Hopkins apply with force: "No man has a right to use anything except for the end for which it was given" (*Ethics*, p. 160).

This brings us to consider the most important question of personal vitality. The life-germ, or power for parenthood, has two functions: (1) the

mental and physical perfecting of the individual, and (2) the perpetuation of the race.

Its presence and circulation in the blood gives fatness of bone, strength of tissue, fulness of muscle, force of mind, and spring of movement.

And any diminution of this power of parenthood is a diminution of vitality. And an impartation of this power, by both sexes, to extend the race, is so far a mutual parting with life in order to start another life. This scientific truth is proved by the fact that excesses here undermine the health of trespassers.

And the false notion that the communication of this life-power is essential to health, is the claim of lust instead of learning. This false notion is meeting merited, although belated, rebuke in the light of later learning and higher ideals on part of the medical profession.

*Seventy-five* honored physicians of New York City have declared: "In view of the widespread suffering, physical disease, deplorable hereditary results and moral deterioration inseparable from unchaste living, the undersigned members of the medical profession of New York and vicinity unite in declaring that chastity, a pure continent life for both sexes, is consonant with the best conditions of *mental, moral and physical* health." From sixty physicians in Philadelphia I have a similar statement" (M. E. Teats' *Way of God in Marriage*, p. 87).

Notice: "A pure continent life for both sexes is consonant with the best conditions of *mental, moral and physical* health." This would abolish and exclude forever the unnatural and most harmful practice of incontinence during the periods of gestation and lactation.

I say "*unnatural* practice of incontinence during

gestation," for among the many animal orders lower than man, the strictest continence is observed instinctively. And "among primitive people, the 'unnatural practice' is said to be unknown" (Dr. Bayer).

I heard the world renowned missionary, Rev. William Taylor, afterwards Methodist Episcopal Bishop of Africa, say that when in Africa he knew of a tribe with ideals of marital purity so high that if a man was known to break the law of continence during his wife's period of gestation, they would cut him into pieces, and feed him to the fishes.

It is amazing beyond measure that any man civilized, not to say a Christian, should so debase himself by lust as to disregard this natural law of continence in the expectant mother.

From the foregoing accounts of plant and animal improvement in race-culture, it is clear that those improvements were made at the start of life. And the chief factors in the problem have been selection, sustentation and association.

1. Selection implies the choice of partners sexually mated to produce strong offspring.

2. Sustentation requires the exclusion of harmful foods and a proper supply of nutritious elements.

3. And association denotes companionship favorable to amiable disposition.

These three principles are carefully observed in improving the lower orders of animal life, but have been strangely ignored in the human species. In consequence domestic discord, divorce, and disintegration of the religious and civil community ensue.

A foolish prudery concerning the laws of life and the sacredness of sex has withheld wholesome



instruction from the children and youth, and often allowed ignorance and lust to shape their tender years, sapping health and multiplying human degenerates.

The insidious nature of lewd thought and the infectious character of lustful indulgence victimizing even little children, is not suspected. Many of them are born licentious in consequence of marital incontinence of their parents during gestation.

Here is a case of early childhood contamination: I am creditably informed of a rural community of about two hundred children and young people where but one—a girl—was free from sexual vice. And the defilement of that community was begun by an impure young woman seducing a little boy of five years!

The noted educator of Massachusetts, *Horace Mann*, visited a school of about two hundred boys, and he believed that every boy was contaminated with this frightful leprosy!

"And yet in my whole life," said he, "I have never heard a word of caution uttered warning the young against the contamination of this foul disease. In all the sermons I have ever heard, I have never known an allusion to be made to this great evil."

"What an indictment! When no other class of sins receives such continuous and woeful condemnation, from Genesis to Revelation!" (B. H. Mix).

Mr. Mann continues: "When I was ten years old my father sent me to a famous academy in Massachusetts, famous especially for its high-toned orthodoxy, on the presumption that I should be subject to the highest and best religious influences; but I never heard a word from any of our teachers that tended to elevate our characters and save us from moral destruction. The wonder is that any of us



escaped destruction" (Miss Belle H. Mix, in Vanguard).

Because of the baneful, if not criminal, silence on this vital subject, on part of parents, the gospel ministry, educators in school and university, legislators, the medical profession and the public press, sexual impurity "has a frightful prevalence in our land" (Bishop Thomas M. Clark of Rhode Island).

"In a city of 12,000 population, a well known physician of large practice, who thoroughly knew the people, declared there was scarcely a pure young man in the city. He had in possession, at the time, the names of *sixty young men*, many of them at the very top of society and business, and, I am ashamed to say it, not a few of them members of the church, whom he knew professionally to be guilty of the low vice."

We have seen above that heredity plays a prominent part in life's drama. Prenatal life has engaged the profoundest thought of biologists from the time of Hippocrates [400 B. C.] till now. Its origin and method of procedure have eluded the keenest test by microscope and chemistry.

Any general agreement has not been reached. Different theories have been adopted, to be modified, or set aside entirely by subsequent investigation.

Naegeli called the physical basis of life *idioplasm*—true living substance. Weismann changed it to *germ-plasm*. He was followed by Minot, saying: "Germ-plasm is all wrong." And so on through Nusbaum, Gruber, Haberlandt, Korscheldt, Hertwig, Roux, Virchow, Darwin, Brooks, Galton and Tyndal and others. All verifying the statement of Mr. Charles Darwin: "The laws of inheritance are quite unknown" (Origin of Species, p. 19).

But the immovable *fact* of inheritance, or heredity stands forth clear as the meridian sun. The great susceptibility of matter to mind is manifest everywhere. Life and mind organize and mold matter, so that one's body and its movements express his mental qualities. This is apparent to every close observer.

In fact, all creation is the expression of God's thought: "The heavens declare [speak forth] the glory of God" (Psa. 19:1); "The heavens declare His righteousness" (Psa. 97:6); "That which may be known of God—the invisible things are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" (Rom. 1:19, 20).

Were we sufficiently spiritual, sensitive to nature, and able to apprehend the moral significance of creation, we should find it everywhere revealing God. But through the fall in Eden man lost the ability to read the skies. Only as influenced by the Holy Spirit do men see creation to be the expression of God's mind.

That our atmosphere is vibrant with human thought, was not suspected before *Marconi* found a way to read it. And how the wireless telegraphy suggests the idea that all creation is thought-revealing.

President Hitchcock says: "The discoveries of modern science show us that there is a literal sense in which the *material creation* receives from all our words and actions an impression that can never be effaced" (Gregory, *Christian Ethics*, p. 154).

Professor Babbage declares "The air is one vast library on whose pages are forever written all that man has ever said, or woman whispered." . . .  
"Could man command the mathematics of superior

mind, every particle of air thus set in motion could be traced through all its changes, with as much precision as the astronomer can point out the path of the heavenly bodies" (Gregory, *Christian Ethics*, p. 155).

Strictly speaking, individual and isolated life is scientifically impossible.

This sealed domain of thought in matter and mind was open to Jesus: "And Jesus knew their thoughts" (Matt. 12:25); "He knowing their thoughts (Luke 11:17) needed not that any should testify of man, for He knew what is in man" (John 2:25).

A fair interpretation suggests this universal thought-reading to become general when the full light of the gospel age shall have been entered: "For nothing is secret that shall not be made manifest; neither anything hid that shall not be known and come abroad" (Luke 8:17).

The terms of this text forbid its reference to the revelations of the general judgment day. To "be known and come abroad" must refer to a coming civilization.

External nature being so sensitive to thought and feeling, what must be the influence of maternal thought and feeling upon *internal* nature? How susceptible to impressions of maternal thought and feeling is embryonic life! The plate in the camera of the photographer is not more sensitive to the light, than is the forming infant to maternal impressions.

#### DISEASED LIFE-GERM.

We have seen how maternal thought and feeling frame unborn infant life and shape moral character.

But the life-germ itself becomes diseased. Life-cells convey to coming generations the trend and

virus of diseases contracted in violating the animal appetites. On the indissoluble union between morals and the appetites, our Lord admonishes: "Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged [dulled, stupefied] with surfeiting [over-eating] and drunkenness [carousing, intoxication] and the cares of this life" (Luke 21:34).

The facts of science prove gluttony, licentiousness, alcoholism and narcotism to be transmissible.

Alcohol poisons the blood, deadens the nerves, and hardens the brain. "The stomach of one dying of *delirium tremens* is black with putrefaction."

Life insurance tables show the mortality of liquor-users to be 500 per cent. greater than that of abstainers.

Its greatest curse comes in heredity. "Of all the appetites the inherited appetite for drunkenness is the most direful." The life-germ is alcoholized. And, when it has developed into an organism, every tissue in every bone, muscle and nerve is alcoholized, craves alcohol, and at the touch of alcohol fires into fury for open indulgence. Only the victim knows the base, bitter thralldom.

*Narcotism* is quite similar to this. The opium habit and the tobacco habit stand alike for deterioration, disease, and death. The latter being the more common in western civilization, is specially considered here.

Dr. Pidduck, sixteen years St. Giles' Dispensary, declares: "Tobacco poisons the blood, and that leeches instantly drop off dead from the bodies of smokers, as soon as they begin to draw blood."

"Chemists, botanists, and physicians unite in pronouncing tobacco one of the most deadly poisons known" (Dr. J. H. Kellog).

"One grain of nicotine instantly kills a mastiff"

(Dr. King). It will destroy human life in two to five minutes. "Oil of tobacco" on the point of a needle puncturing a bird kills it immediately. "One drop on the tongue of a cat caused death in *two* minutes."

"Tobacco smoke: A. Vogel and Reischauer find it to contain (1) sulphuretted hydrogen, 'deadly poison' (2) hydrocyanic acid; prussic acid, a 'most fatal poison'" (Silliman Chem., p. 487). "A single drop on the tongue of a large dog produced instant death."

Eminent authors agree that in striking at the vital centres of the animal life, tobacco particularly deadens the moral sense.

Like alcoholism, *narcotism* poisons, in heredity, the physical basis of life—the power for parenthood. Much of the present puny, devitalized, and nervous condition of American children is traceable to the paternal "tobacco habit." The *London Lancet*, of highest medical authority, declares: "In no instance is the sin of the father more strikingly visited upon his children than the sin of tobacco smoking."

Dr. Richards, of high British authority, says: "I do not hesitate to say that if a community of both sexes whose progenitors were finely formed and powerful, were to be trained to the early practice of smoking and if marriage were confined to the smokers, an inferior race of men and women would be reared up."

A thorough study of this question as to present effects on body and mind and of transmitted influences on posterity, will justify the statement of Dr. John Cowan: "No two habits so blast and deform the soul of man, made in God's own image, as do alcohol and tobacco; and it is useless for a man to try and live a healthy and continent life, who in the remotest way, continues in their use."

It is a menace to the nation. In the late Spanish-American war, seventy-five per cent. of enlisting men were rejected because of the "tobacco heart." No more deceiving, debasing, dismantling force jeopardizes the race than the transmitted devitalizing workings of the "tobacco habit." Every pure woman and every man who stands for a strong manhood and a clean posterity should demand its banishment from society. Let the twin-evils of rum and tobacco go down in endless infamy together.

#### CHILD TRAINING.

Having been well born hails the future. It is the promise of increasing good. It is the foundation of a right life. It is a cause and conservator of clean character.

From the foregoing facts on heredity and prenatal impressions, it would seem that everything depends on how we are born. This may not be exclusively true, but the statement swells with truth.

Eugenics and heredity consider especially the life-factors of the past and the present. They index the past. Single catch-words of feature and of look enlarge into volumes of gone secret thought and unrecorded deeds of base desire, when exposed to the latest searchlight of biological research.

But this is not all. Eugenics and heredity forecast the future. They also indicate lines of instruction to be pursued in order to counteract hereditary evil and encourage inborn good.

It is fundamental in child training that thought and feeling affect the blood. Everyone sees this blushed in crimson or blanched on cheek of rage. And thought-affected blood forms tissue, and tissue builds bone and flesh, making the body an expression of the mind. I recall a man of nearly fifty years ago whose wriggling,



irascible gait always reminded me of the movements of a scorpion—the embodiment of anger.

That thought and feeling carve feature and form, is a vital truth that should be among the first things taught the infant. At a very tender age feelings are known as pleasing and painful. A mirror will show the infant their respective physical settings in the face. These settings become permanent. This fact is fundamental in science: "The soul is the image of the spirit, and makes the body the image of itself" (Delitzsch-Biblical Psychology, p. 272).

I shall never forget Daniel——, of sixty-five years ago, whose face was always set ready for a "big cry," although a man of mature years. It came about in this way: When Daniel was yet a little child, his parents penned him on the porch while they hoed corn nearby. Whenever they came near the house, his mother would look and listen for Daniel; and, hearing his crying, which was constant, her mother-heart would exclaim, "*Der Daniel heilt alsnock*" (Daniel cries still), and she would hoe back again with her husband to the distant side of the field. Returning always found Daniel crying, getting in answer only the mother's wail, "*Der Daniel heilt alsnock*."

Little Daniel's unceasing crying carved in his face indelibly the lines of grief. Just so anger, lust, revenge, etc., get their permanent facial setting.

Were children informed of this inexorable law of life, how general would be their rejecting of the "naughty" and accepting of the good, the true, and the beautiful!

What shall be taught, and when? are foremost questions. The Sacred Scriptures give the needed information.

Timothy was a young man of exceptionally pure character. Paul declared he had none else like him



(Phil. 2:20-22). He had been well born. His incomparable character was found first in the grandmother, Lois, and the mother, Eunice" (2 Tim. 1:5).

In addition to this, Timothy was scientifically trained. Right knowledge was rightly given, adapted to capacity. The Divine record is: "From a child [*brephos*, infant, *unborn*, or *just born*—Gr.] thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith, which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. 3:15).

And this was the ancient Jewish custom, as indicated in Isa. 28:9, 10: "Whom shall ye teach knowledge? And whom shall he make to understand doctrine? Them that are *weaned from the milk* and *drawn from the breasts*. For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little and there a little."

The Divine precept to teach eternal truths to the child from its birth, is not invalidated by the fact of great differences in moral and mental susceptibility in children. Some waken to moral consciousness with the dawn of reason, while others seem insensible to spiritual influences for many months or even some years. But such are the exception, and may be, in part, accounted for by the weakness of the spiritual influences of environment.

Jeremiah was a case of connate spiritual life (Jer. 1:5-10). And the record of his life shows *no break*. Furthermore, John Baptist was "filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb" (Luke 1:15).

Infantile inquiries concerning God and human life are often inscrutable to the philosopher. This is a matter of common observation. And it is on account of the close union between the infant and the Eternal Spirit.

Of this union some always retain a clear recollection.

Bishop William Taylor, of Africa, tells of his infantile communion with God and how he lost it.

Personally I have a very clear recollection of infantile fellowship with God. While yet in my kilts I played religious meeting with my next elder brother in papa's fence-corner, which we had roofed with clapboards, thus forming our little three-cornered church with largest side all open. Sacred place it was. God's presence made it holy. A heavenly light seemed to fill my heart and the place.

One day especially my heart felt very warm toward God. It seemed *really hot*. And I felt a strong upward pull, as though some one in the sky was pulling on my heart. Blissful times, those! No fact in the past seventy years stands out clearer in memory.

O worlds! that those experiences had never been forfeited!

A few years later I lost all by disobeying my mother. Then I feared to go out of doors after dark. And I dreaded going upstairs to bed in the dark.

Not until twenty years of age when I was powerfully converted, did I again feel that heavenly peace and love. But the joys of the new-birth were recognized as the experience of inner light and love I had enjoyed in my infancy.

A clear case of infant fellowship with God is that of Helen Burt. At about two-and-a-half years of age she obtained, lived and testified a pure heart. Later on, under very trying and protracted provocation she gave way to impatience, and ran to her mother with gushing tears, exclaiming, "*O mama, mama, I lost my pure heart!*" I could fill pages with most convincing testimony in this case, which occurred in my own pastorate.

I know of another case similar to this. A grandchild of about two years came running to grandmother,

shouting: "Bamma, I know sancti'"—grandma, I know sanctification. "What is it, dear?" "Why, Dod reach down His hand in my heart, and take something out, like a lump of dirt, and throw it away."

The grandmother had lived entire sanctification (1 Thess. 5:23, 24). The little child imbibed the light, and later gave it verbal form. For simplicity and accuracy of definition, what theologian will better the illustration?

Truly, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger" (Psa. 8:2). . . . "Children crying in the temple, 'Hosanna to the Son of David!' Jesus saith . . . 'Yea, have ye never read, out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?' (Matt. 21:15, 16).

Infant Christianity of this sort is rare, because accepting the gospel atonement for infants is rare. Just as Christ Jesus is at once both complete atonement for the sinner and the redeemed sinner's example for holy living, so is He the complete atonement for the infant and the example for the redeemed infant. Our Lord's infancy as well as His manhood was truly the pattern for the redeemed race.

Rightly M. de Presseusé declares: "Christ did more than simply assume human nature. He became the head of a new humanity, and its representative before God" (Early Years of Christianity, p. 273). As this head of a new humanity, He was infant as well as adult; and he must be infant in order to be adult.

Likewise Dr. F. Godet: "Jesus created a holy humanity in His person, and the Spirit has the task and power to reproduce in us this new humanity" (Comment on John 17:19). This "holy humanity" (new humanity), in the "person of Jesus," was in His person

as *infant* as well as *adult*—was infant in order to be adult.

Unbelief—stark unbelief, prevents the concrete realization of this new Christ-race in both its adulthood and its infancy.

God's provision "unto all the fulness of God" (Eph. 3:19), being "strengthened with all might, according to His glorious power" (Col. 1:11), and "working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight through Jesus Christ" (Heb. 13:21), is regarded as too high a standard; so, instead of this, men would accept the Divine provision only to a degree—approximately. Similar doing in domestic life would regard God's law of water boiling at 212 degrees Fahrenheit as too high a standard, and would heat water to a degree only—approximately, say 100 degrees in hope of cooking a meal!

And if the boiling point for water varied at different times, with constant changing in other physical laws, life would be impossible. Throughout the domain of nature physical law is unalterably fixed. And this symbolizes moral law as invariably *fixed*. Holy Scripture abounds with illustrations: Cosmical (Jer. 31:35, 36); terrene (Gal. 6:7, 8).

Scientifically exact is our Lord's statement: "If ye abide in me, and my words [laws] abide in you; ask what ye will and it shall be done unto you" (John 15:7). Accordingly, "Hold fast the form [accurate outline] of sound words . . . in faith and love, which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. 1:13).

The unnatural, unreasonable, destructive habit of preferring a part to the whole, "*the substitution of an inferior good for the highest good*, the world for God, *is at the root of immorality*" (Fisher, Theistic and Christian Belief, p. 357), and incurs the Divine penalty: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven

against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold down [hinder] the truth in unrighteousness" (Rom. 1:18).

The Bible is not a book of reference, as some would use it, but God's law of absolute authority. By it we shall be judged: "He that rejecteth me, and *receiveth not my words*, hath one that judgeth him: the *word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day*" (John 12:48). According to it, we shall be punished: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God and that *obey not the gospel* of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His power" (2 Thess. 1:8-9).

These Scriptures of future retribution prove that the Divine provision and performance of gospel grace for both adult and infant, must be accepted at full value.

#### INFANT GRACE APPLIED.

This illustration, true to life, shows how the infant comes to see its personal need, and how it may get that need supplied:

"Little Mamie of *two* years, excited with anger, feels very unhappy and cries out in tears. At the proper moment her mother breaks in, 'My poor Mamie! Mama feels sorry for dear Mamie! Mama's heart used to feel that same hurt. And Mama looked to Jesus, and took Him to cure that hurt in the heart; and He took it all away and keeps Mama's heart so pure and full of love. And *He will now do the same* for my *own dear Mamie!* Blessed Jesus, how I love him!'"

A known instance is the following: "Among the first words she [Bessie Sherman Ashton] learned were words of prayer and praise. When three and a half

years old she knew enough to give her heart to Jesus. She said, 'Mama, Jesus, has taken the naughty out, and put the happy in.' And Ernest is not yet two years old, but he often leads the little prayer meetings. He will say, 'Come, Egie, pay'—pray" (Mrs. Anna S. Osborn in *Vanguard*, 1907).

The moral state of infants in the gospel dispensation is not generally understood. In fact, it is very much misunderstood. That Adam's sin entailed upon his offspring spiritual death and consequent Divine condemnation has been generally allowed; but that Christ "hath put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself" (Heb. 9:26), freeing the race from all disadvantage from Adam's sin, is not generally apprehended.

The truth on this point is well expressed by the eminent polemic of the Wesleyan Reformation, the Rev. John Fletcher, Vicar of Madeley: "Adam brought a general condemnation and a universal seed of death upon all infants; so Christ brings upon them a general justification and a universal seed of life" (Fletcher's Works, Vol. I., p. 284).

The Apostle Paul shows not only a moral equivalent in the atonement for man's loss by the fall, but he declares the abounding pre-eminence of Christ over Adam: "Not as the offense, so, also is the free gift. For if through offense of one [Adam] many be dead, *much more* the grace of God and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many" (Rom. 5:15). "Therefore as by the offense of one [Adam] judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one [Christ] the free gift came upon all men *unto justification of life*" (Rom. 5:18).

So all infants are born in a two-fold moral state—having a bent toward sin and a "justification unto life," securing Divine favor (Mark 10:14).



Generally this bent toward sin is nourished by influences and training actually sinful, causing choice of sin at the age of accountability, instead of nourishing the "justification unto life" by godly influences and training, resulting in choice of righteousness at the age of accountability. And God has made saving faith easy by the utter helplessness of infancy, compelling trust in the mother. Thus the faith-faculty is first, and designed to be foremost throughout life: "The just shall live by faith" (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11).

#### INSTRUCTION IN YOUTH.

The early part of youth—from *four* to *twelve* years of age—is a period of immense interests. If I mistake not, this is the most important period in human life. Here principles are rooted in personality that form character for all time.

Fundamental and first in order are the laws of self-preservation and of self-development. This is the only safeguard against the early perversion of life-forces.

Best authorities on juvenile reform declare that "seventy-five per cent. of all children have a vicious knowledge of sex matters before they are ten years old." "One five-year-old boy in —Home had a knowledge of sex matters incredibly vile, and he was teaching every other child with whom he came in contact" (The Light, p. 70, January, 1910).

On the other hand, early curiosity makes this teaching the laws of life a necessity. A "child of *two-and-a-half* years lived in the country, and was bound to see creation all about him. His mother, ignorant on these subjects, had made one law to herself, namely, that she would never tell that boy a lie, whatever question he might ask.

"One day this child was playing with his pet cat



. . . And he was pulling that cat about; and his mother said, 'Don't do that; you will hurt Velvetena. Some day soon I will tell you the loveliest story you ever heard in all your life' . . . A few days afterwards he came running to his mother, pulled her by the hand, and said, 'Mother, . . . Look what I have got in my blue cupboard! How did they get there? Dear little baby kittens!' And the mother sat down on the ground and took the little boy in her arms, and said, 'Now I will tell you that beautiful story that I promised you some days ago. Do you remember when you were pulling Velvetena, and mother told you not to hurt her?' 'Ah! but Velvetena has grown so very thin; she must be very hungry' . . . The mother went on to say: 'Do you know, dear, the little birds and all the beautiful animals that God has made were once tiny, tiny seeds like the seeds in the flowers in your garden? . . . God hides the seeds away in a little warm, comfortable nest inside mother's body, and they grow, and grow; and mother thinks about them and loves them, and wonders what they will be like when they have grown big enough to come into mother's arms, and let her show everybody what a beautiful thing God has made for her.' And the boy looked at the kittens, then at the cat, and then at his mother, and said, 'Oh, how lovely! *Was I once part of you?*' (The Light, January, 1908, p. 31).

Another mother told her little daughter the beginning of life in plants and animals, and how God had given her a warm nest under mama's heart until she grew strong enough, when by mama's severe suffering a short time she was brought forth a sweet baby into mama's arms.

Deeply moved by this recital, the child threw her

arms about her mother's neck, exclaiming, "Dear mama, *I do love you so!*—more than ever, because you did so much for me."

Nothing else can, like this, unite child and parent in tender love and confidence, affording a strong bond in family government.

But on the other hand, when the child's inquiry how life begins is met by the rebuff, "Hush! you must not talk about such things," causing in the child a feeling of shame, secrecy, if not guilt, and perhaps a greater curiosity to be satisfied by lewd lips later on. Such repulse from parental confidence enters a bar to filial trust and to family government.

What can be done to impress parents with the unspeakable importance of this matter, and their tremendous responsibility in the case? The Bishop of London says: "I am convinced that the uplifting of the morality of our people lies, above all and everything else, in educating the children rationally and morally. I believe that more evil has been done by the squeamishness of parents who are afraid to instruct their children in the vital facts of life than by all the other agencies of life put together."

Judge B. Lindsey, of juvenile court fame, Denver, Colorado, declares with emphasis: "I am convinced that this whole moral question among children is by far the most important problem that concerns the preservation of the American home. If the nation decay, as decay it must if the home is undermined, it is because mothers and fathers have proved false; it is because mothers and fathers are traitors to childhood's sacred cause. These are strong words, truly, but I have facts from actual experience upon which to base them."

Now that "mothers and fathers have proved false," and are "traitors to childhood's sacred cause," what shall be said of the worldly church as the "temple of God" (1 Cor. 3:16), and the "light of the world" (Matt. 5:14); and what of its man-pleasing ministry as "watchmen" safeguarding the public welfare (Ezek. 33:7, 8), and as "Shepherds to feed the flock of God" (1 Peter 5:2)?

The general silence and manifest indifference would seem utterly impossible in the face of the almost universal demoralization regarding sex and in the face of the appalling disclosures of vice and crime. Instance:

1. *The increasing crimes among children, against virtue and life itself*, as the juvenile courts attest.

Hon. E. T. Gerry, of New York City, after an investigation extending to various parts of the country, made the estimate that eighty-seven per cent. of the children between certain ages were addicted to an impure practice that is filling our institutions for the feeble-minded, our insane hospitals, and preparing both patrons and inmates of houses of shame."

Out of four hundred boys personally questioned by one city superintendent of schools only *seven* professed to be free from impure habits! That is only one in fifty-seven!

Eminent authorities are united in the statement that "seventy-five per cent. of all children have vicious knowledge of sex matters before they are ten years of age." One degenerate girl of seven years was discovered demoralizing six little boys in the kindergarten! "A single boy of fourteen years instructed every child in a large public school in Chicago, in vicious habits."

A still more shocking "sexual degeneracy is

where the father outrages his own child." Mrs. Amigh, superintendent, Training School for Delinquent Girls, Geneva, Ill., "finds that sixty out of her four hundred and eighty girls had their first experience in vice with their own father!" (The Light, January, 1910, pp. 70, 71).

Deliberate murders are committed by little children: "Union, S. C., April 9, 1909—Fred Bell, *six* years old, is in jail here charged with murder. He shot and killed Ethel Thomas, aged *three* years, and then attempted to hide the body" (News-Bee, April 9, 1909).

A more appalling case: "October 12, 1904, Emmett Robinson, *three* years old, of Nyack, N. Y., killed his baby sister, *one* month old, with a bronze statuette, on Saturday evening last, striking it six blows. The motive was jealousy. The child had been teased that he was no longer 'the baby pet' of the family."

2. *The appalling prevalence of sexual vice and crime among persons of mature years.* Prenatal influences cause the greater part. Ignorance and lust go hand in hand.

(1) "Physicians declare self-abuse to be almost universal" . . . "Ninety to ninety-six per cent. of the males at some time in life, to some extent, practice this sin" (Prof. T. W. Shannon, Perfect Manhood, p. 61). "Medical authorities estimate that thirty-five per cent. of women at some time in life practice secret sin" (Perfect Manhood, p. 44).

(2) There are in America over 400,000 "fallen women" in lust resorts. It requires about 75,000 to 80,000 fresh recruits to supply the death-rate every year. That is, 6,666 every month; 220 per day; and about nine every hour; or one innocent

girl decoyed and robbed of virtue every seven minutes!

(3) "Startling! In Chicago, recently [1910] a twelve-year-old girl was rescued in a resort, and held for recognition at a police station. A simple announcement of the fact in a morning paper brought inquiries from *five hundred* parents whose daughters had recently disappeared!" (The Light, May, 1910, p. 18).

The lack of self-knowledge respecting sex is the chief cause of this wholesale destruction of young women.

Denslow Lewis, M. D., declares on thirty years of experience: "I have seen hundreds of cases where the daughters of our best families in different parts of our country have gone down to degradation because they were ignorant and confiding, and believed the words of their seducers."

An inmate of the Florence Rescue Home, New York City, said to the matron [speaking for her comrades]: "We never had a chance to learn about ourselves before; and we would have been better girls if we had been taught all about ourselves."

This lack of self-knowledge regarding sex lies at the root of the sexual degradation of young men, with a few exceptional cases. It is the eminent Dr. Morrow's estimate, before the American Medical Association, "that there are *four hundred and fifty thousand* boys in our country who each year make the fatal plunge into the whirlpool of lust. That is 1,250 every day, or 52 every hour! Almost *one every minute!*"

The following fact will show the factor of ignorance in the problem of the 450,000 ruined boys:

"Statistics gathered from a number of representative colleges in the Middle States show that only

one young man in *twenty* received from his parents any adequate instruction on these subjects before he left home" . . . "What must be the mental condition of the youth from the less thrifty families?" (The Light, May, 1910, p. 38).

A salutary testimony is that of the great American educator, Horace Mann: "At college I was taught the motions of the heavenly bodies as if their keeping in their orbits depended upon my knowing them, while I was in profound ignorance of the laws of health of my own body. The rest of my life was, in consequence, one long battle with exhausted energies" (The Light, January, 1907, p. 16).

3. *Worse still are the cruel wrongs and the atrocious crimes committed in wedlock.*

Marital purity is the exception. That the voluntary exercise of the sexual function is limited to the production of offspring, is not yet the teaching, nor the practice of the generality of educators, physicians and even clergymen—not to mention the people at large.

For this desecration and perversion of the sacred powers of parenthood, the man is chiefly responsible. A husband's claim to exceptional prerogative over his wife is based on her supposed inferiority, contrary to Nature's law; for the animals observe the law of continence. It is also contrary to God's law: "The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband; and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but his wife" (1 Cor. 7:4).

A wife's submission to her husband has its limit, "as unto the Lord" (Eph. 5:22), "as it is fit in the Lord (Col. 3:10).

God's law for the sexual use of our bodies is



explicit and absolute: "Now the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord; and the Lord for the body" . . . "What, know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's" (1 Cor. 6:13, 19, 20). See Rom. 6:13, 19; 1 Peter 1:15, 16.

God repeatedly declared His absolute right to every faculty and function of the human personality. I wondered for years why "foolish talking and jesting" were classed with "fornication and all uncleanness." Instance:

"Be ye therefore imitators of God, as beloved children; and walk in love, even as Christ also loved you" . . . "But fornication and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not even be named among you, as becometh saints; nor filthiness, nor foolish talking, or jesting, which are not befitting" (Eph. 5:1-4) [R. V.]

In what is their resemblance as the ground of this classification?

My residence in India led to the solution of this question. Among the Hindus are men who are not given to "foolish talking" nor to "jesting," but are free to commit "fornication."

I then saw that the Bible was given for the whole world as well as for the individual. I saw, too, that as "fornication and all uncleanness" were the perverting of a physical function, just so were "foolish talking and jesting" the perverting of a mental function—a perversion, or bad use, all the same, only of a higher order. The motive, or aim, in both cases is the same—forbidden pleasure. Jestings violates the foregoing Scriptures as really as forni-



cation does, by preferring self-gratification to "the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:31). And both are as really destructive of true godliness, hence their classification above.

### STARTLING DISCLOSURES.

1. A few detestable but incontrovertible facts must be given to show the enormity of marital wrongs inflicted upon thousands of innocent women.

"A noted Eastern physician in a lecture before the St. Louis Young Men's Christian Association, recently stated that *eighty* per cent. of all diseases peculiar to married women were due to venereal diseases contracted from their husbands" (The Liberator, p. 23, August, 1908).

"It is claimed by specialists in this field that at least *sixty-five* per cent. of the operations that women are subjected to in the hospitals are the result of infection from their husbands" (Sexual Hygiene, p. 83).

"We need not wonder at the number of youthful suicides and criminals, under the conditions that control in marriage, nor marvel that so many mere babes practice unmentionable vices. Lust gave them their life-trend at its very beginning, and deepened the dark work during the prenatal months.

"The wife of a college professor recently said she was talking with a social acquaintance on purity, especially of the righteous law of continence during the prenatal period, when the other exclaimed: "I don't know where you will find those willing to regard it!" . . .

A man who meets many thousands of professing

Christians in each twelve months, many of them ministers, says: "It seems exceedingly rare to find this truth (marital purity) understood or advocated."

"A personal acquaintance of mine, an earnest Christian woman, a college graduate, married a minister of her church who was classed as a successful pastor and whom she believed to be as 'good as gold.' Prior to her marriage she had not known an ill day; but from that event her health rapidly declined through the sickening abuse of her life-partner, until physical suffering and nervous prostration almost drove her insane."

"I am acquainted with another case in which a beautiful young girl married a young man in her own social circle, that of culture and wealth. His abuse of her became so great that she would be seized with a nervous chill when she heard his step in the hall. His nature was so perverted by the demon of lust that he would come home from the office during the day, and with threats on his lips and a pistol in hand, compel submission to his debased desires."

"It is high time that teachers of religion and morality recognize more clearly the stupendous importance of the purity problem, especially as it relates to family life, which determines the character of social, municipal and national life" (Belle H. Mix, in *Vanguard*).

The Rev. J. M. Pike, of long experience and wide observation in rescue work, and editor of *The Way of Faith*, has declared: "No one but those definitely at work among the impure can have any conception of the impurity of this age. It is not confined to the slums or houses of prostitution, but it seems to have become the besetting sin of those who profess the

deeper lines of spirituality. I am amazed and confounded at the revelations that have come to me. There is no question at all in my mind that the greatest hindrance to spiritual life . . . lies along this line."

Other marital misdemeanors of deeper turpitude are withheld as too indecent for publication. In the face of known facts, the following words of Miss Frances E. Willard are very mild: "Because these (temperance and purity) have not yet been wrought out into success, the world is bewildered by crooked thought and besmirched by personal uncleanness. The blows of inebriated husbands are falling fast upon the bodies of defenseless wives and children; and that most holy thing in all the world, the wedded love of two, is being murdered by the deadliest lust" (Last Address).

It is quite evident that the marital wrongs under discussion are in consequence of the "double standard" of morals that has obtained from the remote past. Young women have been held to the standard of unsullied purity, while young men have been indulged in "sowing wild oats." This unjust discrimination is the root-curse of our civilization.

The editor of "The Ladies Home Journal" [June, 1908], makes the following wholesome observations: "The double standard of morality of the sexes has perplexed thousands of women. Thousands of mothers have accepted departures from their ideas of morality on the part of their sons as inevitable because 'hygienic reasons were hinted at which women cannot understand.'"

It is due to women that they should know the truth. "Sowing wild oats" on the part of a young man was strangely enough believed by many, both medical and non-medical men alike, to be a physical necessity, whereas, from no medical studies or investigation

anywhere attainable, would such a "physical necessity" hold good.

All the great medical organizations the world over, stand as an absolute unit on the fallacy that a young man is physically the worse for living a clean moral life. The entire weight of evidence of the world's foremost medical knowledge is unreservedly of the opinion that he is physically the better for it.

The distinguished specialists of the International Brussels Congress declared, as a body, that a clean moral life for a man is not prejudicial to health, but on the contrary is to be recommended from a purely hygienic point of view.

The foremost German medical society took the same ground.

Fourier, one of the greatest specialists in the world, said of the so-called "physical dangers" of strict morality in men, "I do not know them."

The foremost medical society in America for the study of this subject, stamps the "wild oats" fallacy as one of the most dangerous errors to be counteracted, and roundly condemns the idea, almost universally prevalent among young men that "sowing wild oats" is a "physical necessity essential to their health."

The action taken by these eminent medical societies in Europe and America and the testimony of individuals distinguished in the medical profession, must excite the gratitude and admiration of every true woman and right-thinking man. For, to banish the deadly fallacy of "sowing wild oats" from the millions of boys and men annually ruined by it, and to point the millions of virtuous youth into the highway of spotless character that leads to high achievement and noble parenthood, is indeed the crowning rescue work.

The greatest of all reforms comes now into sight,

"*A White Life for Two*," as Miss Frances E. Willard called it, declaring, "You must be as pure and true as you require me to be, ere I give you my hand" (*World's Parliament of Religions*, Vol. II., p. 1233).

We are moving toward this Scriptural standard by slow but increasing speed. Modern research proves it to be the law of Nature, which is the law of God as truly as the Decalogue is the law of God. Our approach toward the single standard of morality for both sexes is not very near yet, for we have had a great distance to come. Our remote ancestry was pagan. And in Paganism womankind is always at great disadvantage.

The following facts will indicate our past improvement, and show our progress of late to have been more rapid:

Among our Aryan descendants whether in Hinduism [190,000,000] or in Buddhism [147,000,000] woman has been thought a being to please man by manual labor and sexual service, as having no soul nor immortality except through man. A Hindu of culture, in proof of their religious unity, said, "We all believe in the sanctity of the cow and the depravity of woman."

And their Brahmin philosophers—profound in transcendental philosophy, but strangely awry in social science, inflict upon woman the deepest degradation. By the *Institutes of Menu*, "Woman can have no separate holy rites, nor perform for herself any acts of devotion." And according to the *Veda*, "Woman is so bad that she is simply an incarnation of sin. She cannot be trusted. Her evidence in law cannot be taken. She must not read the sacred books, as she is to have no concern with religious rites."

This degrading bondage was broken when our pagan ancestors accepted Christ, who came "to set at liberty

them that are bruised" (Acts 4:18), and establish a new order wherein "there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28).

But toward the end of the *first* century a reaction set in—"a dislike to the public ministrations of women," which "intensified into abhorrence before the middle of the *Second Century*" (Prof. Ramsay, Aberdeen). "Nevertheless, woman kept her place as an unveiled 'Presbytress' in the church until the 'Council of Laodicea' [A. D. 360?] forbade her ordination, and forbade women entering within the altar" (Prof. Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire).

The apostacy abolishing the common priesthood of believers (1 Peter 2:9; Rev. 1:6) forfeited Divine inspiration (1 Cor. 12:6-11), and putting in its place stated preaching, in time turned the church into a hierarchy of ritualism, magical rites and exciting legends, bringing on the Dark Ages, out of which, centuries later, we came paganized, with woman degraded from her rank and excluded from the education that might regain it.

A few nobler of the clergy founded *Harvard* in 1638 to supply an educated ministry, but still debar-ring woman from even a common school education. This privilege was granted her *one hundred and fifty-three* years later, in 1791. But not until 1828—*thirty-seven* years later—were girls allowed in all grades in primary schools.

It is only *thirty-two* years ago, in 1878, that the first high school for girls was opened in Boston. And then some objected (1) that it was not Scriptural; (2) that if educated, women would preach; (3) that physically they cannot bear the strain. Bishop E. O. Haven relates the following: "In 1853 [only fifty-seven years ago] when professor in the Michigan State University, I said 'the university ought to be open alike to men



and women.' A fellow professor declared, 'I was crazy!' but in sixteen years I saw, as president, the university opened by the legislature."

Now there are in the United States four hundred and fifty-one colleges and universities. Of these three hundred and ten are co-educational; and, in addition, there are forty-three colleges exclusively for women.

Now the great universities of Europe and America, with few exceptions, are open alike to men and women.

Now with twice as many women as men teaching the public schools, and more than twice as many girls as boys graduating from the high schools, and with women increasingly taking the class-honors in college and university studies, and with their success in domestic economy and business, agriculture and manufacture, literature, and politics, and the learned professions of medicine and law, their fitness and natural right to equal rank with men is no longer a question. Indeed, their success in the four hundred occupations now entered and their superior enthusiasm in education [President Andrew White, Cornell University, says, "as a rule lady students average *ten* per cent. better in class-examinations than young men"] forecasting higher intelligence in wives than in husbands, renders their subjection to belated, deteriorated men an insufferable outrage.

That this language may not seem extravagant, additional to the foregoing marital *wrongs*, it may be well to glance into the horrors of

#### MARITAL CRIME.

The marital crime here considered is the destruction of human life yet unborn. It violates the sixth commandment of the Decalogue, "*Thou shalt not kill.*" So far all agree. But difference of opinion exists as to when life begins. "Many women are taught that



life begins at the time of 'quickening,' therefore it is no harm to arrest pregnancy previous to feelings of motion. Others believe there is no life till birth" (Tokology, p. 245).

Much ignorance has existed, and still exists, on this subject, not only among the uneducated, but also among physicians and legislators. Five states (Connecticut, Minnesota, Oregon, Arkansas and Mississippi) by legislation make wilful abortion a crime under penalty only if the mother "be quick with child!"

But "quickening" marks a stage of development in infant life, and not the *fact* of that life simply; therefore the fallacy of such legislation! How absurd it would be if a judge and jury were to fix the guilt of a murderer upon the age of his victim instead of the criminality of the murderer's *act*!

Modern research proves beyond question that life is present from the moment of conception; hence it is a foul act of murder to extinguish it. In absence of this knowledge, such act is not possible without self-condemnation. Innocence abhors the violation of nature. Herod's massacre of infants at Bethlehem sinks into insignificance when compared with the wholesale slaughter of unborn infants in America. Often the motive is of less importance than was Herod's. Mrs. Grannis, president of the National League for the Promotion of Purity, New York, tells of a highly educated young wife who "was having the *fifth* abortion, with no earthly reason, only because she did not wish to be laid aside from society!" (The Light, July, 1908, p. 47).

The enormity of this crime is indicated by the data given by Rudolph Wieser Holmes, M. D., chairman, Committee on Criminal Abortion, Chicago Medical Society: "A physician, eighty-one years old, convicted of abortion-murder, said, 'I've done *five thousand* of

them in my time'!" [Think of a man committing five thousand murders of helpless infants!]

A criminal operator of Boston with three others "had done some three thousand illegal operations in five years," and suggestively said, "And we are not the only ones doing it, either!"

"Miss Crowell informs us that an official gives his opinion that over *one hundred thousand* criminal operations are performed in New York annually!

"A detective in Chicago found not far from one hundred abortionists who do *twenty-five thousand* annually.

"There are five hundred midwives in Chicago, of whom one hundred and seventy-five do *seventeen thousand and five hundred* annually. Adding the twenty-five thousand and the seventeen thousand and five hundred gives forty-two thousand, five hundred. Then there are 'numerous bath-parlors, massage rooms, etc., where abortions are done.'"

To show the defection of the public conscience, Dr. Holmes cites the following: "A professional abortionist, now serving a ten-year sentence in the Maryland penitentiary, had a petition presented to the governor asking for his pardon. On the petition were the names of state senators and representatives, a member or two of Congress, lawyers, merchants, clergymen, women, physicians; and the jury which convicted him unanimously signed their names" . . . "A state senator stated that one-half of the house of delegates and a majority of the senate had signed the petition!" (The Light, July, 1908, pp. 42-47).

Dr. Holmes assures us that the criminal conditions in Chicago are not exceptional; that the malady is general throughout the land: "Permit me most emphatically to disabuse your minds of any thought that the state of affairs in Chicago is any more grewsome than

the world in general. Chicago contains no larger shrine to Moloch than New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Paris, or London" (The Light, July, 1908).

"The Dr. McLeod case in Boston revealed that one group of five doctors had performed *more than seven thousand* criminal operations during one year" (Chicago Tribune).

In review, facing the cruel wrongs and the atrocious crimes of murdering [annually one million?] unborn infants, all under cover of wedlock, and the consequent hereditary harm and crime, who can excuse the silence and apparent indifference on part of the pulpit and the religious press in general?

War and famine, for destruction of human life, fall short of this social desolation threatening the future of the nation. And what shall be said of the generally silent, indifferent [some cases accessory] clergy? "Shepherds that cannot understand" (Isa. 56:10, 11). "Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? Behold, I am against the shepherds; and I will require my flock at their hand" (Ezek. 34:1, 10).

The kind of marital *wrongs* and the marital *crimes* cited above [a few examples out of many thousands] should create a revulsion of public sentiment that would at once demand a single standard of purity for both sexes.

And still there are

#### OTHER WEIGHTY REASONS

for such single standard:

1. The lifelong suffering and sorrow of pure, unsuspecting wives, in consequence of sexual vice on part of their husbands before marriage, may no longer be endured without protest. That children are born with reduced vitality; with nerves unstrung; with keen sus-

ceptibility to disease, invites investigation. These are effects of corresponding causes. That healthy, pure wives give birth to children affected with infectious diseases, discloses sexual vice on part of their husbands. Nature's law of reproduction is inexorable, and brings into the open every secret sin.

Prof. William T. Belfield, Rush Medical College, Secretary Chicago Society of Social Hygiene, declares that: "Promiscuous and clandestine indulgence of the reproductive instinct, everywhere prevalent, . . . causes gonorrhea and syphilis. So prevalent are these in our large cities that at least *half the adult population* of all social grades, according to conservative estimates, contract one or both of these!" (White Slave Trade, p. 299).

Gonorrhea, formerly deemed "an annoyance" similar to a cold, is now discovered to be an insidious destroyer of domestic happiness and national welfare.

The distinguished Winfield Scott Hall, Ph.D. (Leipzig), M. D. (Leipzig), Professor Physiology, Northwestern University, in his address before the Illinois Vigilance Association, February 8, 1909, said: "When a student in a medical school twenty-five years ago, it was a common thing to pass over, with some jocose remark, the disease of gonorrhea. But that isn't done any more. Why? Because it is now proven to the medical profession that gonorrhea is quite as dangerous as syphilis. But the people in general do not know that . . . Young men cannot afford to run the risk of gonorrhea; because it may not only wreck their own lives, but the germs may lurk there and may be transmitted two or three or more years later to some innocent bride" (White Slave Trade, p. 294).

Dr. Hall further states that: "Statistics show that of the operations on women in the hospitals of New York City, year before last (1907), sixty-five per cent.

of these operations were brought about and necessitated because of gonorrheal infection" . . . "I say to young men, 'fellows, isn't it time that we have a single standard of purity for men and women?'"

2. Another weighty reason for this single standard of purity is the blindness of so many thousands of children in consequence of sexual vice.

Dr. Neisser, of Berlin, discovered the vice-germ that causes ophthalmia of the new-born.

He says: "After careful investigation throughout Germany he concludes from statistics that there are 30,000 blind in Germany from this cause. In that proportion all Europe would have 200,000.

Miss Helen Keller, the far-famed blind and deaf graduate of Radcliff College, has a natural right to speak on this subject. In the *Ladies Home Journal*, January, 1909, she says: "Continuous study of blindness has forced upon me knowledge of this subject . . . I cannot, without accusing myself of cowardice, gloss over or ignore the fundamental evil.

"I once believed that blindness, deafness, tuberculosis, and other causes of suffering were necessary, unpreventable. I believed that we must accept blind eyes, deaf ears, diseased lungs, as we accept the havoc of tornadoes and deluges . . . But gradually my reading extended, and I found that these evils are to be laid, not at the door of Providence, but at the door of mankind, that they are in large measure due to ignorance, stupidity and sin.

"The most common cause of blindness is ophthalmia of the new-born. One pupil in three at the 'Institution for the Blind' in New York City, was blinded in infancy by this disease.

"One-fourth of the inmates of the New York State Home for the Blind, six hundred sightless persons in the State of New York, and between six and seven

thousand persons in the United States, were plunged into darkness by ophthalmia of the new-born.

"The symptoms of the disease appear in the infant's eyes soon after birth. The eyelids swell and become red; and about the second day they discharge a whitish pus . . .

"There is a remedy . . . an installation of nitrate of silver solution into the eyes of the child . . .

"In France and Germany the laws require that the eyes of every child shall be treated with nitrate of silver solution as soon as it is born. And in these countries there has been a considerable decrease in blindness from the scourge of ophthalmia neonatorum [of new-born] . . . This is a specific germ received from the husband infected in licentious relations before or since marriage and communicated to the child . . . It is part of the bitter harvest of the 'wild oats' he has sown.

"Of the consequences of social sin, blindness is by no means the most terrible. The same infection which blots out the eyes of the baby is responsible for many childless homes; for thousands of cases of lifelong invalidism; for *eighty* per cent. of all inflammatory diseases peculiar to women; and for *seventy-five* per cent. of all operations performed on mothers to save their lives."

This question of the sex-life has the lengthy consideration here because it is fundamental; and because its perversion is the most detrimental. Of all our appetites, it is by nature the strongest; therefore it is the most likely to take control, spreading discord and destruction throughout the entire organism.

Its perversion is the most insidious; beginning with sweetest pleasure, advancing by stealthy seizure, and ending in hopeless ruin. Hence the need of further consideration as to protection.



## CHAPTER VII.

## ETHICAL PROPHYLAXIS.

Prophylaxis is "the art of preserving from, or of preventing disease; the observance of the rules necessary for the preservation of health" (Webster).

It is to avoid the things that cause disease. It is to fortify against disease. It is to guard against disease beforehand; hence the word prophylaxis, from the Greek *pro*—before, and *phulassein*—to guard, to guard beforehand.

Prophylaxis, the art of avoiding disease, is fast taking the place of therapeutics, the art of curing disease.

Now, in application, the change is easily made from the medical to the moral use of these terms. Moral prophylaxis is fast taking the place of moral therapeutics. It is easier to avoid sin and vice than to be cured of them. More and more the regeneration of adult sinners moves toward infancy. Very few people are converted at middle-age and beyond. The great majority return to God between the ages of ten and twenty years. The Divine regeneration of the race involves the human generation of the race.

Moral prophylaxis requires

## A PROPER DIET.

What to eat? When to eat? How to eat? How much to eat? are questions that always shape character and limit destiny. Wrong diet dates the decline and final downfall of individuals and of nations (Ezek. 16:49). This question of food is fundamental and of transcending importance.



It is easier to avoid a wrong thing than the misuse of a right thing. Eating food is essentially a good thing, but eating food to excess is bad. This is so insidious. Its presence and progress open the way to eating foods that are intrinsically harmful. If it were the intrusion of an open, outward evil, it could be quickly seen and avoided; but it is an inward essential good simply pressed beyond its God-appointed limit; therefore it is not detected until it has become a habit. Because of these characteristics, it is well suited to deceive into gluttony and decoy into drunkenness with its mate, licentiousness; hence our Lord's warning: "Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness," etc.—"with all animal excesses, quenching spirituality" (Brown and Fawcett).

On the relation of food to sexual purity, the distinguished Dr. J. H. Kellogg, superintendent, Battle Creek Sanitarium, says: "The influence of dietetic habits should rank next to heredity. It is an observed fact that all libertines are great eaters . . . Nothing tends so powerfully to keep the passions in abeyance as a simple diet" (Plain Facts, p. 292).

So the editor of *The Medical Brief*, St. Louis, U. S. A., has wisely said: "The question of diet is the most important problem before the medical profession to-day." Likewise Alfred Eichholtz, M. D., says: "Food is the point about which turns the whole problem of degeneracy" (Strength and Diet, p. 119). And the eminent Sir James C. Browne, M. D., F. R. S., declares that: "This question of food is one of primary importance, far more than education."

1. *Foods, etc., interdicted*—These naturally tend to excite the sexual instinct. Such are animal fats, pork, rich puddings, lard-pastries, alcohol, tobacco, all strong teas, strong coffee.

The tannin in tea and coffee irritates the stomach and weakens the gastric juice. "Tea has much more tannin than coffee, and is, therefore, more injurious." And green teas have about twice as much tannin as black teas.

On the sexual influence of food, the eminent Dr. J. H. Kellogg says: "Stimulating food, pepper, vinegar, mustard, spices, condiments generally, tea, coffee and excess of animal food, have clearly appreciable influence in inducing premature occurrence of puberty, and should be prohibited" (Plain Facts, p. 76).

It is apparent that the constant use of sexual stimulants cause undue development of the sexual nature, putting it in control of the entire organism and thereby inducing sexual excesses with all their consequent evils. The only remedy is prohibition.

2. *Foods under special limitation*—These naturally tend to clog the circulatory system by supplying nitrogenous material in excess of assimilation. Instance, excess of animal food, newly-baked yeast bread, soggy potatoes, etc., etc.

Such foods oppress the nervous system and becloud the spiritual nature, subjecting one easily to the sway of the lower appetites.

One class of reformers radically declare: "Crime and sin are the heritage of *base* meat eating. Let youth be fed on preferred grains, and have no meat fiber till after fourteen or fifteen, and the sins of youth will be unknown."

For sustentation, animal food is surely not needed; for whole wheat bread contains all the elements of the human body. The various cereals—wheat, oats, rice, etc., etc., in their manifold preparations afford a diet at once much more nutritious and much cheaper than meat.

This much-disputed point of diet must not be dis-

missed till we have further consulted science and history. The "radical reformers" in hygiene have in their favor some incontestable facts of history, ancient and modern.

From creation to the deluge—fifteen and a half centuries—all were vegetarians.

And since then "The Orientals have been at all times sparing in the use of animal food" (McClintock and Strong, Bib. Theol. Eccl. Encycl., Vol. II., p. 797). The Jews from Abraham to the Christian era—about two thousand years—have totally abstained from swine's flesh, and have used other meats sparingly (Angus, Bible Handbook, p. 280); according to the Divine precepts: "And the swine . . . he is unclean unto you. Of their flesh shall ye not eat, and their carcase shall ye not touch; they are unclean to you" (Lev. 11:7, 8); "Be not among wine-bibbers; among riotous eaters of flesh" (Prov. 23:20).

The Persians, the span of whose empire once included North India on the East and Egypt on the West, held the world-sceptre of civilization for centuries, as vegetarians living on *one* meal a day.

"What made the troops of Cyrus, thought to be invincible, was the temperance and hard life to which they were accustomed from their infancy, having nothing but water for their ordinary drink, and bread and roots [vegetables] for their food," etc. (Rollin, Ancient History, Vol. I., p. 200).

The Greeks achieved the highest intellectual culture and best physical development of the world, by being vegetarians eating *two* meals a day.

Under their great law-giver, *Lycurgus*, Sparta had a common table for all citizens, rich and poor, old and young, whose diet was fixed by law, and consisted of "coarse black bread, beans and fish" (Ridpath, Hist. of World, Vol. II., p. 169).

Pythagoras [570 B. C.] dieted on bread, honey and herbs. He founded the first vegetable club of *three hundred* young men at Crotona. Of him remarks Plutarch [70 B. C.]: "You ask on what grounds Pythagoras abstained from feeding on the flesh of animals? I, for my part, wonder of what sort of feeling, mind, or reason that man was possessed who was the first to pollute his mouth with gore, and to allow his lips to touch the flesh of a murdered being," etc. (Good Health, 1904, p. 285).

So Dr. Graham declares: "The Roman soldier was far the most powerful and heroic in Rome's earliest days when he subsisted on his vegetable diet" (Russel, Strength and Diet, p. 117). At that early day, the diet of Rome consisted in "black bread (barley), beans and other pulse with fish added" (Ridpath, History of the World, Vol. II., p. 243).

Coming to modern times, "The Rajputs and Sikhs of the Punjab (India), are stronger than Europeans, and endure more fatigue. Their diet is wheaten flour—*two* meals a day (Sir. C. Campbell, Commissioner in Chief, Indian Army).

Dr. Adam Ferguson [Edinburgh], the historian, after strokes of paralysis, became at *sixty* a Pythagorean, eating only vegetables and drinking water and milk, got rid of every paralytical symptom, became robust, muscular and lived to *ninety*" (Russel, Strength and Diet, p. 334).

The Chinese minister at Washington [1909] declared: "The Chinese all-around laborer easily distances all competitors, on a diet of a few bowls of rice" (Strength and Diet, p. 170).

"The Japanese," says Mr. Peery, "are the most vegetarian race on earth. Japan is about wholly vegetarian. They use forty kinds of beans and peas, rice, rye, barley, wheat, maize. They do not polish the

rice, which removes one-fourth of the fiber material."

The Japanese are now a study as to the source of their power.

A writer says: "The Japanese are allowed to be among the strongest people on earth. They are strong mentally and physically; and yet they practically eat no meat at all. The diet which enables them to develop such hard frames and such well-balanced, keen brains, consists almost wholly of rice, steamed or boiled, while the better-to-do add to this Spartan fare, fish, eggs, vegetables and fruits.

"For beverages they use weak tea, withour sugar or milk, and water which is imbibed in what we should consider prodigious quantities . . . The average Japanese individual swallows about one gallon daily, in divided doses."

Their unparalleled strength has come about in this manner: "In 1849 the Emperor appointed a commission to see what steps should be taken to improve the Japanese physique. One question submitted was whether a partial meat diet would be an advantage. So far as meat went, the commission reported: 'The Japanese had always managed to do without it. Their power of endurance and their athletic prowess exceeded that of any Caucasian race.' Japan's diet stands on a foundation of rice" (Russell, *Strength and Diet*, p. 201).

Mr. G. Lynch says: "The Japanese possess the greatest endurance of any people on earth" (Russell, *Strength and Diet*, p. 294). In evidence is the campaign of 1900 [Boxer Insurrection]. In the advance upon Peking, the Japanese outmarched the armies of Russia, Germany, England, France and the United States.

After the foregoing facts, this statement of the eminent biologist and physician, Sir Henry Thompson,

M. D., F. R. C. S., will be accepted at full value: "It is a vulgar [common] error to regard meats in any form as necessary to life. All that is necessary to the human body can be supplied by the vegetable kingdom" (Diet, Relation to Age and Activity, p. 70).

It is well to remember that eating meat is of modern origin; that oats constituted the main diet of Europe for *two thousand years*. The Irish in ancient times, living principally on vegetable diet, were designated, as late as Spencer [1782] *poeephagoi*—"herb-eaters." In 1763 slaughtered bullocks for food in Scotland were wholly unknown (McCulloch) (Strength and Diet, p. 132).

All agree that purity and strength of blood are chief factors in the health of body and mind. All agree that, to have pure and strong blood, all foreign and effete matter must be removed from the system, and no more introduced from without.

Now, it is well known that the human body becomes poisonous immediately after death, and why not also the bodies of other animals? J. H. Kellogg, M. D., declares: "Decomposition of an animal begins within twenty-four hours after death, even if the carcass is kept in an ice-box. Flesh that is tender, has high flavor, is always well started on the road to decay . . . Such meat is found to be swarming with bacteria" (Voice, September 9, 1897).

It requires no strain of the reasoning faculty to see that such deadly matter, clogging the circulatory system, tends to induce disease; actually does oppress the nervous system, and dulls the moral and spiritual faculties, favoring the commission of crime and the perversion of the powers of parenthood. Wherefore this strongest of all human appetites needs, for its proper direction, the free poise of the mental and moral powers quickened and transformed by the almighty in-



workings of God's grace (2 Thess. 2:13,14; 2 Cor. 3:18; Col. 1:9-11; Heb. 13:20, 21).

Herein we see that Christ crucified is the only rational solution of creation. "He is before all things and by Him all things consist" (Col. 1:17).

The formerly skeptical Swiss historian, Johann Von Mueller, convincingly declares: "The gospel is the perfection of all philosophy, the key to all the seeming contradictions of the physical and the moral world. Since I have known the Savior everything is clear."

In order to manifest this power of the gospel to restore man to the forfeited nature of God and the harmony of heaven, physical and mental degenerates in consequence of sexual vice, and moral perverts in consequence of hereditary and Satanic influences, were made whole by the miracles of Christ (John 5:14). And any relapses were preventable by gospel dietetics and spiritual hygiene (Luke 21:34; 1 Cor. 10:31; 6:19, 20).

Hygiene requires proper *quantity* in eating as well as proper quality. It is an open question whether wrong quantity is not doing more harm than wrong quality. The sin of over-eating is all but universal, and is said to produce more disease than all other causes. The best of food over-fed is harmful. And over-feeding comes of great variety of dishes at the same meal.

Protest has been entered by a line of physiologists ever since the time of Hippocrates [460 B. C.] and Galen [130 A. D.]. Pliny [23 A. D.] declared: "Many dishes bring many diseases." And the illustrious Avicenna [980 A. D.] a distinguished Arabic physician, declared: "Nothing is worse than feeding on many dishes." And the scholarly, facetious, Robert Burton [nom de plume, "Democritus Junior," 1576 A. D.]



said, "This gluttony kills more than the sword" (Anatomy Melancholy, p. 142).

"All dietetic facts and principles go to establish these two conclusions (1) that all eat double the quantity of food necessary for the attainment of the highest state of mental and physical vigor and endurance, (2) that over-eating is the great cause of modern disease" (Human Science, p. 463).

"Before the National Academy of Sciences recently [1904] Prof. Chittenden of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University, gave the results of the last year's experiments in diet. They were undertaken to ascertain whether the average healthy man eats too much. They proved, said Prof. Chittenden, that a third to one-half the average daily consumption of food is sufficient to keep a man in perfect health" (Michigan Christian Advocate, 1904).

A fundamental principle of physiology is seen in the statement of a modern pioneer in hygiene, Edward Hooker Dewey, M. D., that: "*Every disease that affects mankind is a constitutional possibility developed into disease by more or less habitual eating in excess of the supply of gastric juice.*"

In order to avoid over-eating, most people find it easier to omit one meal of the day than to reduce each meal to hygienic standard. They are like the noted Dr. Ben Johnson, who said: "I can abstain, but I cannot moderate." Conscious of the tyranny of morbid appetite, Dr. Dewey himself confesses: "I am free to say that I know of nothing in the line of human duty so difficult as to avoid an excessive meal" (True Science of Living, p. 302).

Observing the following rules of hygiene will secure the proper self-control and consequent health and lengthened life:

1. *Avoid eating in the early morning.* Why not

omit the evening meal instead? Because during sleep in the night bodily tissue has not been consumed by muscular activity. Hence there is not a need for food to supply tissue.

2. *Eat only at the call of natural hunger.* Hunger is nature's call for tissue-forming material. Food received before a created need for it, lies undigested in the stomach and ferments, clogging the circulation with poisonous matter.

3. *Never crowd the mouth with food.* Children are apt to form this habit when unusually hungry. It hinders proper salivating of the food and leads to over-eating and subjection to the lower appetites. Unbridled appetite for food forecasts a loose rein on appetite for sex.

4. *Chew every mouthful into a liquid state.* Because all starch foods are digested only in the mouth, and enter at once into the circulation; and all nitrogenous foods need this thorough mastication to prepare them for digestion in the stomach.

5. *Avoid eating many kinds of food at one meal.* It hinders digestion and tends to excess in eating. Eminent physiologists have written against it for more than twenty-three centuries.

6. *Never drink at meals and one hour thereafter.* It hinders proper mastication and weakens digestion in the mouth, and retards gastric digestion in the stomach.

7. *Never "piece between meals."* It deprives the stomach of needed rest, and interferes with the regular meals by creating abnormal appetite in the place of natural hunger, and finally deranges the entire system of digestion.

Revelation as well as nature favors the foregoing principles of diet:

"Woe unto thee, O Land, when thy king is a child ;

and thy princes eat in the morning. Blessed art thou, O Land, when thy king is the son of nobles, and thy princes eat in due season for strength and not for drunkenness" (Ecclesiastes 10:16, 17).

Dr. Adam Clarke comments: "In ancient nations the custom was to eat but once, and that about mid-day." And on Acts 10:10, he says: "The dinner among the ancients was a very slight meal; and they had no breakfast; their supper was their principal meal."

In the Scripture just quoted puerility of government is connected with self-indulgent princes who "eat in the morning"; contrariwise, nobility of government is connected with patriotic princes who "eat in due [right] time for strength" in place of lust.

We have seen from the history of past nations that their ascent to greatness and glory, was characterized by mainly a vegetable diet of *one* or *two* meals a day; and, contrariwise, that their decline and downfall were consequent upon their change to a great variety of foods and flesh of animals for self-gratification instead of the public good.

It is forcibly manifest that a proper diet rightly used is a mighty factor in the problem of sexual purity.

Next in the natural order of moral helps to personal and social purity is the question of

#### PROPER DRESS.

The great importance of this question is seen in its being a chief factor in forming and expressing character.

"The clothing of man is not simply for protection against the weather, but also largely a suggestive expression of the inner life." . . . "Clothing is beau-

tiful only as it is really expressive of a character, whether it be of the nation or the individual (Wuttke, *Christian Ethics*, Vol. II., pp. 209, 245).

It is because of this law that Parisian exploiters of lust create styles of dress suited to excite the sexual instinct in men. And many unsuspecting women are deluded into adopting their insidiously suggestive fashions, through mere love of display; nevertheless, thereby they become promoters of sexual impurity. In evidence is the testimony of the Chicago Juvenile Protective Association: "Dress causes the downfall of the majority of girls who go astray" (*Purity Journal*, June 1910).

The bared arms, the "peekaboo front," and the *décolleté* waist exposing charms sacred to womanhood, appeal directly to man's sexual instinct. In consequence many men are weakened in moral restraint and led into low ideals of womanhood. Knowingly to exert such influences is declared by Professor Gregory to be downright immorality. "It is evident from the importance of man's higher nature, that the man who attempts to weaken the moral and religious restraints which keep men from moral evil, is guilty of a most atrocious vice, and is one of the worst enemies of mankind" (*Ethics*, p. 265).

The susceptibility of men to the influence of enticingly attired women appears in the testimony of Professor T. W. Shannon, A. M.: "I have lived a continent life . . . As a husband, father, educator and minister, I pledge you my honor that the greatest trials, the sorest temptations, I have ever met, have come from improperly dressed women and semi-nude pictures" (*Perfect Manhood*, p. 59).

I doubt not that the widespread prevalence of this downright immorality is a chief barrier to the progress of Christianity. A clergyman of wide observation,

the Rev. T. DeWitt Talmage, D. D., said that he believed "thousands of men are in hell, whose eternal damnation is due to the improper dress of women."

On this point John Wesley administered the following rebuke: "The fact is plain and undeniable; it has this effect both upon the wearer and the beholder. You poison the beholder with far more of this base appetite than otherwise he would feel. Did you not *know* this would be the natural consequence of your elegant adorning? To push the question home, did you not desire, did you not *design* it should? You kindle a flame which at the same time consumes both yourself and your admirers. And it is well if it does not plunge both you and them into the flames of hell" (Sermons, Vol. II., p. 261).

When the "majority of girls who go astray" [i. e., about 35,000 in every year], have fallen through the lust of dress, it is high time that all pure women—not to say women in the several churches—should set an example of true womanly modesty, wholesome to follow. The distinguished J. H. Kellogg persuasively declares: "Wealthy women could do more to cure the 'social evil' by adopting plain attire than all the civil authorities by passing license laws or regulating ordinances" (Plain Facts, p. 92).

When will parents give this subject merited consideration? When will they no longer turn an infant daughter into the ways of self-indulgence and sin by ornamenting her with "gold and costly array" in obedience to worldly, sin-enticing usage, forcing premature development of the sexual nature, instead of nourishing the spiritual nature (Rom. 5:18), by example and precept? Will they not cease to jeopardize innocent purity by clothing [unclothing] their youthful daughter in sleeveless dresses so nearly skirtless as to expose her legs above the knee, if not entirely, and that,

too, up to the age of *ten* or *twelve* years, notwithstanding she has been hearing and talking matters of sex ever since she was five or six years old.

That invisible, yet clearly seen enswathement of innocent purity—woman's highest charm—once forfeited, is not regained. A shy demeanor or bold, boisterous mien discloses its absence. Character that is to be in womanhood must be instilled in childhood and conserved in girlhood.

"Adopting plain attire," noticed by Dr. Kellogg, is not a question of expediency first of all. Its authority is not that of social or even national usage. God has spoken. He commands "That the women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shame-fastness [modesty, reverence, Gr.] and sobriety [sound mind]; not with braided hair, and gold or pearls or costly raiment; but (which becometh women professing godliness) through good works" R. V. (1 Tim. 2:9, 10). "Whose adorning, let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel. But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price" (1 Peter 3:3, 4).

Here, in Paul and Peter alike, outward adorning of the body is forbidden, and inward adorning of the spirit is commanded. That excites "fleshly lusts which war against the soul" (1 Peter 2:11); this inspires the heart with meekness unto good works.

Well in place are the wholesome words of the uncrowned queen of women, Miss Frances E. Willard: "Let that mother know, who tricks out her little girl in all the colors of the rainbow; puts rings on her fingers if not 'bells on her toes,' etc., that she has deliberately deformed a body that came fresh from God's hand, and manacled a soul that was made in His im-



age . . . Girls learn the love of dress at their mother's side and at their father's knee . . . Girls are systematically drilled into lust of the eye and the pride of life; into false standards of taste, and those worldly estimates of which look only upon the outward adorning . . .”

“Alas, . . . that reputable women will appear in such costume as makes it difficult for sons and brothers to keep the White Cross pledge. If women realized the unspeakable degradation of this exposure, if they reflected upon the consequences to the world in case all women should dress as they do, if they could be made to know the results that inevitably and swiftly follow such immoral exhibitions . . . they would need no tinge of artificial color for the cheeks which would be carmined with shame . . . If young women knew what is the outcome to those tempted as they are not, of an evening spent in their company, where the low corsage, the naked arm, the whirling dances allure young manhood, they would sink upon their faces before God in penitence. If they realized what distressed parents could tell them, as they have told me, about the results of such temptation upon the conduct of their sons, . . . not even the all-potent dictum of the (im) ‘modistes’ could hereafter bring them to this unchaste disrobing.”

### THE DANCE.

Additional to a “proper diet” and “proper dress” as preventives of sexual impurity, certain diversions and amusements must be absolutely avoided—such as tend to sexual flush.

1. The modern dance is of this class. That certain high schools and universities allow class dances and some social orders, and even churches, allow the



dance is not morally in its favor, but indicates their own deterioration in morality. The following facts prove this:

(1) "Nineteen out of every twenty confessions made to Archbishop Spaulding by fallen girls, attribute their downfall to the dance."

(2) "Seventy-five per cent. of the fallen women in this country and Europe owe their ruin to the dance" (J. B. Culpepper).

(3) "Between eighty and ninety per cent. of fallen women in [American] society can point to the dance as the cause of their downfall."

(4) The dance now, as of old, is demoralizing. Aristotle [Greek] and Diodorus and Cicero [Roman] objected (a) to its over-exertion, (b) to its lasciviousness" (Samson's Art Criticism, p. 39).

These evils of the dance now exist. The long-continued dancing and the unseasonable banquet are deleterious to health. "I once overheard a group of dancing young men say that they were going to quit dancing for a while, as they had such bodily lassitude and mental sluggishness that they were unable to do anything" (Prof. Shannon, Perfect Manhood, p. 55). Their sexual nature had been exhausted.

(5) That the modern dance directly excites lascivious thought and sexual feeling is the general experience. This is not an open question. So evident is the fact, that "most fallen women testify that their first step toward an outcast life was taken in the dance" (Perfect Manhood, p. 54).

The measure of a woman's power to withstand the overtures of designing men is the strength of her determination to keep them at arm's distance. Their touch degrades.

(6) "Do teachers, superintendents, school boards, fathers and mothers realize what it [the dance] is do-

ing? Surely not, or they would rise *en masse* and stamp it out of existence, instead of resting and saying, 'Young folks must have their fun, and that is innocent.' What is it about the dance that will cause the sweet young girl to have that unusual flush on her cheek, to throw aside her maidenly reserve, and too many times that cloak of modesty, and then exclaim, 'I would rather dance than eat!' Is it simply because of exercise? Why then does she not dance with girls? . . . Ah, we know that it is the sex relations that bring a quickening of the pulse. As her hand is placed in his, his arm about her waist, his breath upon her cheek—under the influence of music, laughter, and softened lights, can she be a girl and not feel her pulse bound within her? . . . If he does not feel his pulse quicken while he is dancing with his partner, he will not dance with her again; simply says, 'She is no good to dance with; she doesn't put herself into it enough!'

"Why is it that even high school boys, after the 'hop' that concludes some class party, will visit some ill-famed resort after he has seen his lady home? I have known many cases of this sort to take place while I was a high school instructor" (Florence Ethel Smith, in *The Light*, July, 1909, pp. 31, 32).

(7) The eminent professor of physiology at Northwestern University, W. S. Hall, Ph.D., M. D., suggestively declares: "It hardly seems possible that a virile young man, in his early twenties, could be subjected for several hours to the conditions of the dance hall, where he is brought into very close physical contact with young women, dressed to expose their secondary sexual features, perfumed to excite in man his hereditary sexual instincts; held so close to his partner in the round dance that he is conscious of every movement of her limbs, and all under the influence of arti-

ficial light and music—I say it is hardly possible for a virile young man to be subjected to these conditions without experiencing an extreme sexual excitement . . . All specialists in this field, without a single exception, concur in the belief that the dance is a device of the devil so far as the young men are concerned” (Sexual Hygiene, pp. 147, 148).

It is quite evident that the charm of the modern dance is in the magnetic embrace of the sexes. Purity of thought and of feeling forbids such relations.

Another fatal foe to ethical prophylaxis, or moral preventives, is

#### THE THEATER.

Very closely related to the theater is the sensational novel. Like the theater, it debases the imagination, induces a morbid state of the sensibilities, and instills false standards of individual and social life. Both make it hard to do right and easy to do wrong. Instance: “Judge Depue, of New Jersey, sentenced Alden Fales, a boy of sixteen years old, to be hanged on August 11, 1892, for murder.

“The judge said in sentencing him: ‘You had opportunities for education and religious instruction superior to most persons of your situation in life. You were a member of a Christian church; you attended Sabbath school and were admitted to its communion. Unfortunately, you *gave yourself up to a literature which stimulated your propensity to obtain property dishonestly, and taught you the manner in which noted criminals committed crimes of great atrocity, and the means by which they were successful in avoiding detection.* You did not intend to kill the deceased; but, in perpetrating the robbery you designed, you took his life” (Selected).

"A Government officer says: 'Almost all the boys brought before the criminal courts ascribe their downfall to impure reading.' In almost every state gangs of little thieves have been formed to pilfer stores, etc. Every case is traceable to dime novels," etc. (Mich. Chr. Ad., April 13, 1907). Likewise the immorality of the theater is beyond question. Judge W. W. Foster of General Sessions Court of New York declares: 'Unquestionably stage-crime has a tendency to inspire crime by the most ordinary causes of criminal act, which is traceable to hypnotic suggestion'" (Current Literature, November, 1909).

Archbishop Farley has recently declared that "The theater has never been so vile since the fall of Rome."

"Edward VII. of England, on August 31, 1907, angrily quitted the theater at Marienbad, because of a lewd song by a noted actress. Last year [1910] President Taft did the same thing under like circumstances.

The immorality of the theater is confessed by a prominent actress: "Not long ago a friend said to me, 'My daughter is anxious to prepare herself for the stage. I have tried to dissuade her, but it seems to be of no use, and I'm afraid I must let her have her way. To what dramatic school would you advise me to send her?' 'Well,' I said, 'You might give her a preparatory course in vice.'

"I meant just about that. In the whole theatrical fabric there is almost nothing that is not attended by immorality, indecency or dishonesty, and too frequently by them all. Virtue in women and honor in men are so rare that when they do occur, they are matters of surprised comment, if not derision among the initiated.

"After a period of service covering more years than I like to confess, I am convinced that the theatrical business is the most corrupt in the world; corrupt from

every possible viewpoint; corrupt commercially, artistically, educationally, morally . . . Every year the stage swallows up an army of pretty, fresh-cheeked young women for the rows of its choruses . . . of these girls, not one per cent. stay in it, nor one per cent. escape the damnation that withers soul and body ere the years of youth have fairly passed.

"It is for these reasons that I have written this article . . . The conditions are growing so much worse each year, that I can no longer preserve silence . . . It is common knowledge that certain managers make expensive productions year after year solely through funds contributed by rich men whose proteges have an inclination to shine behind the footlights" (*The Light*, November, 1910, pp. 31, 33, 34).

Some statements in this confession of a long experienced actress, condemning the theater seem very strong; but when noted actresses put upon their best behavior before the President of the United States and before the King of Great Britain and Emperor of India, offend by their indelicacy and obscenity, what may be expected of the stage on common occasions? Some of the plays in Boston and New York City have been so low in lewdness that the police were compelled to call them off.

And a most deplorable aspect of this business is the corrupting of children by the five-cent "moving picture" theaters. These prepare the way to the more immoral theaters. A competent witness declares: "Without a moment's hesitation, I would say after much investigation, one curse of our land is the five-cent theatres" (E. A. Bell, B. A.)

The immoral effect upon the stage-child is fatal. A few cases prove this: The National Child Labor Committee reports that "on the day a committee of the Massachusetts legislature was listening to an argument

by the theatrical managers why the stage should be exempt from the child-labor law, a police court in the city was trying a young woman of twenty-three for participating in the most immoral dancing ever known to the Boston police. She was an actress in one of the 'best' (?) theaters in Boston. Nor is this case so exceptional . . .

"The New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, of several cases, reports the following: No. 1. A young woman trained by her mother for the stage, began her career at the age of *seven*. . . 'Recently in Philadelphia she was arrested for gross immorality and sent to the House of Refuge, having been pronounced by the court utterly depraved.'

"No. 2. 'A little girl of nine who, after a year or two on the stage, was taken in charge by the society, to save her from utter degradation. She had already become morally perverted.'

"No. 3. 'A girl of fifteen, on the stage in New York . . . eloped with an actor and became a mother before she was sixteen. Later she became an inmate of a house of ill-fame, and at the age of twenty-two committed suicide by shooting herself.'

"The report of the National Child Labor Committee states that such instances as the above could be multiplied almost indefinitely" (Central Christian Advocate, September 7, 1910).

Attendance at the theater, so demoralizing to the public, and so destructive of virtue to the stage itself, must be absolutely avoided by all who are determined to be pure in thought and character.



## CHAPTER VIII.

## CHRIST IN GOVERNMENT.

Christ in government is a new idea. It is foreign to present political thinking. Not to mention religion, much less Christ Himself, even morality has been excluded from politics.

Hon. Eli F. Ritter says: "There is a very large and influential school of political teachers who insist that morality, whatever it means, should not be connected in any way with politics or legislation, asserting that men cannot be made moral by legislation" (Moral Law and Civil Law, p. 45).

Viewed from the foremost standpoint of present civilization, his quotation seems strange; but such has been the standard political teaching. John Stuart Mill declares: "Political economy is concerned with man solely as a being who desires wealth . . . It makes entire abstraction of every other human passion and motive." Professor F. A. Walker says: "Political economy has to do with no other subject whatsoever than wealth; especially should the student of economics take care not to allow any purely political, ethical or social considerations influence him in his investigations."

This was the teaching in our colleges and political parties during the past generation. And it gave political thought and legislation an *unmoral*, if not *immoral*, character.

Accordingly a foremost member of the United States Senate, the Hon. John Sherman, of Ohio, declared in his campaign address in 1873: "All parties to be useful must be founded upon political ideas which



affect the framework of our government . . . Questions based upon temperance, religion and morality in all their multiplied forms, ought not to be the basis of parties . . . Religion, morality, etc., should be left to the individual conscience of men" (Cincinnati Gazette).

That is to say, a man moral as a private individual should discard morality on entering into community or public life! Is it a matter of surprise, then, that commercial, municipal and political corruption prevails so generally? We are now reaping what has been sown.

On the immoral fallacy of excluding morality from public life and confining it to private individual matters, *Chancellor Kent* nobly observes: "We ought, not, therefore, to separate the science of public law from that of ethics, nor encourage the dangerous suggestion that governments are not so strictly bound by obligation of truth, justice and humanity, in relation to other powers, as they are in the management of their own local concerns. States, or bodies politic, are to be considered as moral persons, having a public will, capable and free to do right and wrong, inasmuch as they are collections of individuals, each of whom carries with him into the service of the community the same binding law of morality and religion which ought to control his conduct in private life" (Commentaries, Vol. I. [11th Edition], pp. 2, 3).

Other eminent writers on law and economics rightly claim that public, municipal, national, and international transactions are under much greater moral obligation than those of private life, because of the greater interests involved and their wider influence (Woolsey).

"On the other hand, there is a very large and influential school that teaches that morality and religion are the same thing, who believe in the union of Church and state, and that politics and legislation should provide

for and control matters of religion" (Moral Law and Civil Law, p. 46).

In consequence of these opposite extremes, the one excluding morality and religion from politics and the other subjecting morality and religion to politics, the people at large are confused concerning the relation between morals and religion and their connection with politics and legislation. Doubt has been created. A clan of anarchists has risen denouncing all organized effort in both Church and state. Its foremost advocate is *Herr Most*, in his "*Die Freiheit*" [The Freedom], declaring: "Religion, authority and state are all carved out of the same piece of wood—to the devil with them all."

With the multitude, this chaos of opinions obscures the truth. It is well said: "Out of this uncertainty comes a very dangerous sentiment creating the impression that as civil government cannot enforce matters of religion and forms of religious worship, it cannot enforce matters of morality and moral conduct" (Moral Law and Civi. Law, p. 46).

The tendency of all this has been to create an indifference, if not direct opposition, to the enforcement of law.

And to make matters still worse, the general neglect of ministers to preach the law of God and future retribution has weakened obligation and well-nigh destroyed the sense of sin. Of this, one of broad opportunity and wide observation, Dr. J. M. Buckley, declares: "It oppresses us to believe, as we must, that the sense of God in personal experience is diminishing . . . Even from the evangelical churches the sense of sin in large measure departs" (Christian Advocate).

This neglect on part of the ministers of religion meets merited rebuke from Chief Justice Brewer of the United States Supreme Court: "You ministers are

making a fatal mistake in not holding forth before men, as prominently as the previous generation did, the retributive justice of God. You have fallen into a sentimental style of rhapsodizing over the love of God, and you are not appealing to that fear of future punishment which your Lord and Master made such a prominent element in His preaching. And we are seeing the effects of it in the widespread demoralization of private virtue and corruption of public conscience throughout the land."

But still more insidious and destructive than this general neglect on part of ministers, is that position, boldly discarding, under guise of superior religion, the sovereignty of God and the authority of His law, blurring the distinctions of right and wrong and condoning wilful transgression.

The distinguished philosopher Borden P. Bowne, states this insidious and fatal heresy as follows: "We are fast displacing the entire conception of God as governor by the conception of God as father. And the conception of the Divine government is giving place to the conception of the Divine family . . . Our traditional categories of the saved and unsaved cannot be applied in any hard and fast manner . . . Men are not so much saved as they are becoming saved; and men are not so much lost as they are becoming lost . . . And sin itself, as we find it among men, is largely the wilfulness of freedom which has not learned self-control, rather than any deliberate choice of evil" (*Studies in Christian Life, Zion's Herald*, 1909).

These statements flatly contradict these Scriptures, and are therefore false:

The *chief* and *first* gospel motive is the *Divine government*.

1. "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of

the *kingdom of God* saying, "The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel (Mark 1:14, 15). "I must preach the *kingdom of God* to other cities also; for therefore am I sent" (Luke 4:43). See Matt. 6:33.

2. So the Twelve: "Then He called His twelve disciples together . . . and He sent them to preach the *kingdom of God* and to heal the sick" (Luke 9:2); (Matt. 10:5-8).

3. Likewise the Seventy: "The Lord appointed other seventy also; and sent them two and two before His face into every city and place whither He Himself would come . . . Heal the sick that are therein and say unto them, 'the *kingdom of God* is come nigh unto you'" (Luke 10:1, 9).

That God must cease to be absolute governor in order to be loving father, is a misconception of His character. At the same time, He is both absolute Governor and loving Father.

The extent to which the aforementioned evil forces have spread private crime and public corruption, is alarming. It endangers the nation. In evidence, is the large increase in divorces, suicides and homicides; betrayal of trust in high places of government, of business, and of honor, implicating congressmen, legislators, business corporations, municipalities, politicians and federal citizens [in two counties of Southern Ohio over 3,000 voters have been disfranchised for five years with added fines in some cases, as penalty for selling and buying votes—[these cases are not exceptional]. Another bad effect is the gambling craze. Mr. Chauncey M. Depew declares that "this vice is growing with tremendous rapidity all over the earth, and especially among civilized nations . . . We bet on everything . . . We create artificial conditions and bet upon them. We do the same with real estate,

and we now bet in a different way upon our amusements. Our baseball system has become a lottery, and betting grows in these respects and on races and cards all over the world . . . In clubs and private houses, games of chance of every kind with wagers upon results are becoming as common as the daily dinner."

On this vice of gambling Mr. Anthony Comstock, in 1890, found "One hundred and twenty-eight persons shot or stabbed over gambling tables; four were stabbed and five shot at poker; twelve were stabbed and twenty-four shot over the game of craps with dice; twenty-five were stabbed and fifty-five shot over gaming tables. Besides these, six attempted suicide, twenty-four committed suicide, and sixty were murdered in cold blood."

President White, Cornell University, observes: "The readiness of individuals to take life on the slightest pretexts is one of the most serious symptoms in this country. There is no civilized land in which murders are committed with such impunity. Hence there is no civilized land in which murders are so frequent.

The divorce evil is appalling. In 1909 there was *one* divorce for every *twelve* marriages in the United States. This is the average. The state of Nebraska is reported as having *one* divorce for every *six* marriages (Central Christian Advocate, January 18, 1911).

Statistics gave Germany 11,000 divorces in 1903, and the United States 72,062 in 1906. And there has been a rapid increase ever since. The family is the basis of the nation; therefore this disintegration of the American family forecasts the downfall of the American nation. Our danger is not from abroad. "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must

live through all time or die by suicide" (Abraham Lincoln).

The social arbiter, Frederick Townsend Martin, who "knows American and European society through and through, has been the host of royalty, the associate of aristocrats," alluding to the American home of forty years ago, says: "The Bible is no longer real; religion has lost its hold; the constitution and laws are trampled upon by the rich and powerful, and are no longer held sacred by the poor and weak" . . . "That decay has set in, I know . . . "It is a melancholy fact that the impetus toward extravagance, excess, idleness, debauchery and shamelessness came to us from the underworld."

It is no compliment to American society that the suggestive, questionable styles of fashion are dictated by the "underworld" women of Paris.

Our national decay is asserted by Ralph Waldo Emerson: "I confess our later generation appears ungirt, frivolous . . . The religion of seventy years ago was an iron belt to the mind, giving it construction and force . . . Now men fall abroad, want polarity—suffer in character and intellect . . . To a self-denying, ardent church . . . has succeeded a cold, intellectual race who analyze the prayer and psalm of their forefathers, and the more intellectual reject every yoke of authority . . . In religion, too, we are fast losing or have already lost, our old reverence" (North American Review).

Dr. James H. Potts gives the following characterization: "Divorce excess is only one of the bad symptoms cropping out in our national life. It matches well with such evils as commercial dishonesty, wild speculation, gambling, drunkenness and the prevalent irreligion of every form and name. The American people . . . are tossed about by the winds of false



doctrine, and are venturing far from the tried and true, sound and valuable old ways of faith, sanity, serenity, contentment and reliability. They want to live without work, without restraint, without routine, and just make the moments hum with new experiences more and more exciting and farther and farther removed from the responsible, the constructive, the useful, and the redemptive. Not all the American people are of this spirit; but many are. The blue books bulge with their names. Society news is swollen with their caperings. This is the trouble with our domestic life. We speculate in stocks, scramble for riches, neglect the church, chase after amusement, and go the whole length of the pace that kills" (Michigan Christian Advocate, January 15, 1910).

Such conditions of social, political and religious corruption discarding family obligations, degrading the state, and demoralizing the Church, and doubting the Bible, may well excite the gravest apprehension for our future well-being. This pleasure seeking, self-centred effort instead of devotement to the public good, is sure to bring national disaster. It is this that caused the ruin of all past nations. Hence the warning of the distinguished Hungarian patriot and statesman, *Louis Kossuth*, visiting America: "If shipwreck should ever befall your country, the rock upon which it will split, will be your devotion to your private interests at the expense of your duty to the state."

And what gives still more might to the aforementioned self-centering, law-defying forces of evil, is the statement, under the assumption of superior sanctity wherein "God will be so imminent that no intermediary will be needed," that the "new religion will not be based upon authority" (Charles W. Elliot).

This statement discarding "*authority*" discards law; for without authority there cannot be law, and the



necessary punishment of its defiant violators, consequently an end to all government and human welfare.

This truth demonstrated by all history of civilized humanity is well expressed by the eminent French jurist and philosopher, Baron de Montesquieu: "The idea of a place of future rewards necessarily imports that there is a place of future punishment; and *where the people hope for the one without a fear of the other, civil laws have no force*" (Spirit of Law, p. 276).

To avoid the catastrophe of national overthrow men have in good faith proclaimed

#### MORALITY AS THE REMEDY.

Viewed from the standpoint of our former *unmoral* political training, shown before, this seems quite reasonable. From having no connection with politics to having complete control of politics, is certainly a long step in advance. But a clear view of what morality really is and of what its relation to religion is, will greatly clarify our investigation.

"Moral, pertaining to those intentions and actions of which right and wrong, virtue and vice are predicated.

"Morality, the relation of conformity or nonconformity to the moral standard or rule; quality of an intention, a character, an action, a principle, or a sentiment, when tried by the standard of right" (Webster).

"Religion, the outward act or form by which men indicate their recognition of the existence of a god or of gods having power over their destiny, to whom obedience, service and honor are due" (Webster).

"Religion refers to the inner life and belief. Religion requires a man to love his neighbor as himself, but the civil law cannot compel him to do so, and punish him if he does not.

"Morality requires a man to treat his neighbor hon-

estly and fairly; and can compel him to do so, and punish him if he does not.

"Religion is a matter of belief; morality is a matter of conduct. The law does not interfere with matters of belief, but does undertake to control matters of conduct" (Moral Law and Civil Law, p. 47). "Morality is for this life only. Morality is purely a civil condition; refers to the citizen, to the individual in his relations to other people and society" (Moral Law and Civil Law, p. 50).

The New York Court of Appeals declared: "Sound morality is the cornerstone of the social edifice" (Moral Law and Civil Law, p. 34).

"The greatest object and purpose of civil government under our civilization is to promote and enforce good morals in the relations and transactions of its citizens" (Moral Law and Civil Law, p. 23).

Knowledge, intelligence and morals are emphasized as the true basis in the constitutions of California, North Dakota, Tennessee, etc.

But history proves that the rank of a nation depends upon its religion. For all individual, corporate and national evils, experience—so the word of God—proves true religion to be the sole remedy.

### TRUE RELIGION THE REMEDY.

The complete inefficiency of morality apart from religion is affirmed by the immortal statesman, George Washington: "Reason and experience forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle" (Farewell Address). True religion creates true morality. Hence it is chief as a political necessity.

Accordingly the constitution of North Carolina—so that of Ohio in the same words—places it first

among necessities to good government: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government," etc.

Likewise, Arkansas: Art. 2, Sec. 25, Constitution, 1874: "*Religion*, morality, and knowledge being essential to good government, the General Assembly shall enact suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship" (Moral Law and Civil Law, p. 24). In the same way the constitution of Nebraska names the essentials to good government: "Religion, morality and knowledge." But the constitutions of some other states lay stress on "knowledge," "learning," "intellectual improvement," etc., and make but little or no account of either religion or morality, lest these "get mixed with politics" (?)

How far, if at all, religion and morality shall influence politics and legislation, is an open question with the great majority of American citizens.

Nevertheless, every notable stage of progress in American history is marked by the Christian religion and Christian morality.

Strikingly manifest was this at our beginning when our Pilgrim progenitors fled from the oppressive monarchies of Europe to these wild shores, to found a free government with least hindrance and most helps to human progress.

Their covenant read: "*In the name of God, Amen!* We whose names are underwritten . . . have undertaken for the glory of God and the *advancement of the Christian Faith* . . . to plant the first colony . . . do by these presents solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one another covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid." Their Colonial legisla-

tion shows religion to have been the chief consideration.

During one hundred and fifty years of Colonial and Commonwealth history, British deism and French infidelity made such inroads that when the Federal Constitution was adopted there was therein no reference whatever to God.

Nevertheless, stalwart men in the pulpit, like *Dr. John Mason*, who rebuked the exclusion of God from the National Constitution, and in the United States Congress, conserved the Christian faith; peerless among whom was *George Washington*. A key to his Christian character is that, when others *stood* during prayer by the chaplain at the first Continental Congress, he *knelt*.

Guizot, the French statesman and historian, says of him: "Of all great men, Washington was the most virtuous." The British historian, Green, declares of him: "No nobler figure ever stood in the forefront of a nation's life." Patrick Henry styled him: "The greatest man on that floor" [Congress]. The most illustrious king of that time, Frederick II. of Prussia, characterized General Washington's strategy on the Delaware as: "The most brilliant achievement recorded in military annals," and sent him a sword inscribed: "From the oldest general in Europe to the greatest general in the world." The discriminating historian of America, George Bancroft, declares: "But for *Washington*, the country could not have achieved its independence; but for him it could not have formed its union."

Only such Christian character could withstand and overmatch the flings of the embittered Voltaire and the daring assaults of the infidel, Thomas Payne, staunch patriot as he was.

As time went on, American religious thought be-

came confused and the public conscience blunted by *unmoral* politics, discarding both religion and morality, flooding the country and rising into the United States Senate, where Daniel Webster, rising in commanding form, declared: "*The State must take its ground upon its religion.*"

But for the "Great Awakening" under Jonathan Edwards and the "Wesleyan Reformation" under John Wesley and his associates, religious doubt and moral decay would have ruined the country.

Our national demoralization brought Divine punishment by the fratricidal war of the early "Sixties," when a galaxy of Christian statesmen appeared—Lincoln, Seward, Sumner, Wilson, Chase, *et al.*

In this increased light from heaven, the ship of state "righted about," enthroning God and Christ, as did the Pilgrims in the Colonial days. Politics rose again to the rank of statesmanship.

In the ante-bellum political contest, the majestic Sumner [1851] declared: "Those everlasting rules of right and wrong which are a law to individuals and communities. True politics is simply morals applied to public affairs." And when politicians attempted to obscure the increased light with their interpretation of the Federal Constitution, the eminent Secretary of State, William H. Seward, declared: "*There is a higher law than the Constitution.*"

Under the increasing religious light upon our sins and the forebodings of Divine retribution, the United States Senate, in 1863, enacted the following: "Devoutly recognizing the Supreme Authority and just Government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and nations, and calling on the people in this day of trouble, by the assurance of His word to seek Him for succour, according to His appointed way through Jesus Christ," etc. Additionally the President, Abra-

ham Lincoln, issued a special proclamation appointing a given day for fasting and prayer, that the Divine retribution might be averted and the Union preserved. He also recognized Christ as Lord.

Like the action of the Senate, the proclamation of the President of the United States sanctioned the sovereignty of God and the intercessory rule of Christ. All this restored the American people to their original position to conduct affairs "*for the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith.*" And the favor of God was so great that in ten years the nation rose to such a pitch of power and wealth as to amaze ourselves and astonish the world.

But the spiritual progress of the Church did not keep pace with the financial advancement of the state. In consequence, general American society became enslaved to the love of money and to the greed of luxury—a general bondage greater than the local bondage of negro slavery. Both Greece and Rome had human slavery; but it was the love of money and the lusts of luxury that wrought the ruin of those great empires. Sparta was ruled by seven hundred families, and owned by one hundred of them. "Avarice and luxury have been the ruin of every great state" (Livy). And our greed for wealth and luxury is ominous.

The rush for pelf and pleasure is tremendous. Even the great storm-centre of these forces sounds the alarm. The Wall Street Journal of New York City, speaking of "What makes a great nation," said a few days since: "*We need a revival of pure old-time religion; we have had enough quackery in religions and political cure-alls, but as ever, 'righteousness exalteth a nation,' and the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom*" (Central Christian Advocate, January 18, 1911).

In this revival of pure religion, New Testament



Christianity is our only hope; for truly, as the eminent jurist and German economist, Wilhelm Roscher, declares: "We may boldly assert there never was a nation remarkable for its religiousness and morality, which declined so long as it preserved these highest of all goods" (Political Economy, Vol. I., p. 387).

Nothing short of New Testament Christianity will deliver us from immoral class-distinctions and class-legislation. "Immoral," I say; for, "immoral wants are not only those, the satisfaction of which wounds the conscience, but also those in which the necessities of the soul are postponed to the affording of superfluities of the body, and when the enjoyment of the few is purchased at the expense of the many" (Roscher, Political Economy, Vol. I., p. 222).

These immoral class-discriminations are illustrated in the following facts: (1) "Women in Chicago make *twelve* shirts for *seventy-five* cents, finding their own thread; and finish an elegant cloak for *four* cents! And children work twelve hours a day for one dollar a week" (Frances E. Willard).

(2) "In the United States are eighty thousand boys and girls under sixteen working in textile factories; twenty thousand of them are under twelve years of age. Seven thousand and five hundred children work in glass factories. A child of *four* years was at work in a New York canning factory."

(3) "Twelve thousand children work in tobacco factories. Children of *three* years straighten out tobacco leaves; and of *four* years place covers upon paper boxes. The children are tied in their chairs, so that, falling into a sleep, they will not fall off upon the floor and injure themselves."

(4) "A little girl of five years was seen in the spindle room of a southern mill working at 2 a. m. Their fingers are sometimes crushed in the machinery.



A doctor in a southern mill city admitted that he had amputated over one hundred—some, small baby fingers, as the size denoted."

(5) Apartment wrongs: "A New York clergyman testifies: 'I went into a room ten by twelve feet, in which were eighteen people—men, women and children. They ate, lived and slept in that room!' In St. Louis four young Syrian workmen with families lived in one room. Three were married and had six children among them. Formerly they had occupied different rooms. But, winter coming, no work on streets was to be had, to obtain money to pay rentals, so they all gathered together in one room. The women and children were barefooted, while snow was on the ground and cold blasts of wind came through the rickety door" (Church and Social Problem, p. 57).

Such conditions outrage civilization, not to name Christianity. We legislate against cruelty to animals, but overlook cruelty to our own kind. And all this is charged against the Church—and not without show of justice; for the Church moulds the conscience and guards the welfare of the public. "Whether right or wrong, the laboring men feel that the churches are not their friends; that they are for the rich; that money controls the pulpit and the pew; that preachers, as a rule, either do not care for the rights of the laboring man or that they dare not plead his cause" (Church and Social Problem, p. 79).

In consequence, some revert to atheism, declaring: "The idea of God must be destroyed; it is the key-stone of a perverted civilization" (Marx).

It is gratifying to know that the laboring men as a class retain faith in Christ, although they have lost faith in the Church in general. "Working men before the United States Senate Committee on Labor said: 'Working men do not attend Church, not be-

cause they are irreligious or opposed to Christianity, but because the churches have ceased to represent to us the teachings of Christianity" (Selected).

#### SELF-PROTECTION ORGANIZED.

Self-protection is a natural, inalienable right. It has been styled nature's first law. It denotes distrust, and implies a foe.

As mankind advances from a savage to a civilized state, and from a lower to a higher stage in civilization, different employments multiply, and society divides into distinct classes with an ever-growing interdependence. Lack of mutual consideration leads to minimizing this interdependence and to magnifying the professional differences. As a consequence, competition alienates industrial classes to the injury of society; whereas, mutual co-operation would unite all industries in promoting the public welfare.

But co-operation implies mutual confidence; and mutual confidence implies trustworthy character on part of all interested parties.

In absence of this character, distrust of necessity will exist; and different classes and different industries will organize for self-defense. "Capitalists were allowed to combine from the beginning, and workmen were prohibited under severe penalties" (Outlines Economics, p. 36).

"Guilds monopolized the employments. Non-guild workmen were debarred from employment. So, working secretly, these combined and broke the machines. And a law was passed punishing this act with death" (Outlines Economics, p. 37).

Under the domination of general distrust, it was thought that public good would result from one class being matched against another—holding opposing interests in poise. Adam Smith, styled "the father of

economics," held that: "Self-interest would regulate men's relations for the public good."

This theory dominated business for a century. And "many men perpetrated audacious frauds, got wealthy and retired when found out" (*Outlines Economics*, p. 45). "Competition among employers, ever dictating harder terms to their men" caused trades-unions to multiply secretly ever since 1304 A. D. "Competition did not tolerate the law of benevolence." Adam Smith's theory of self-interest proved a failure. Under increased light, sentiment changed to the public good as the goal of society.

Trades-unions and farmers' alliances now multiplied rapidly. "All labor against all capital" (*Economics*, p. 189) issued in "strikes" on part of working men and "lock-outs" on part of employers. The latter debarred workmen from employment.

It has been said that "Strikes—compulsory arbitration—created more troubles than it settled" (*President Hadley, Economics*, p. 359). Possibly the increased troubles may have come of increased light on wrongs exposed by the strikes. "The street car men of Baltimore by a strike reduced the seventeen hours a day labor down to twelve hours" (*Outlines Economics*, p. 191).

"Between 1880 and 1887 the total number of strikes [European and American] was 22,304. Of these the majority were ordered by labor unions. Of this majority, 10,000 were successful; 3,000 were partial failures; 9,304 were total failures. The total loss to employers was \$30,000,000, and to workmen \$52,000,000. During the same period, "lockouts" by employers numbered 2,214. Of these 1,753 were ordered by organizations; 564 were successful; 190 partially so; 1,339 were total failures. And the loss to employers

was \$3,462,261; to employees, \$8,157,717" (Revised Encycl. Brittanica, Vol. XVII., p. 5,595).

Another indication of good resulting from strikes is the increase of wages for fewer hours' work. In the seventeen great industries: 1850, \$247; 1860, \$284; 1870, \$302; 1880, \$347; 1890, \$445; we have the increase of wages from \$247 to \$445.

In America caste forms on the lines of wealth and occupation, and, more marked than all else, on "color." Race prejudice is a serious problem. That this should deprive one of his personal rights and bar appreciation of his rise into noble character, is without reason in philosophy and religion. Were the blondes among women to organize a guild against the brunettes—how silly! Yet by custom and legislation we discriminate, with as little reason, very unjustly against persons simply because of color or sex. This will be discussed later on.

The optimistic President James A. Garfield portrays the freedom of privilege in American society in his day: "There is no horizontal stratification of society in this country like the rocks in the earth, that hold one class down below for evermore, and let another come to the surface and stay there forever. Our stratification is like the ocean, where from depths of the mighty deep any drop may come up to glitter on the highest wave that rolls" (Social Elements, p. 281).

President Garfield was himself that "drop come from the depths of the mighty deep to glitter on the highest wave that rolls." From the humblest American home he brooked poverty and rose to the highest place of power and of honor, that of President of the United States, where his illustrious character will glitter while ages roll.

"Strikes" and "lockouts" have been economic dynamite disengaging self-centred men and sore-op-

pressed men from fossilized wrong, to ascend the scale of moral excellence. Higher the civilization, less the dynamite.

In the United States "strikes" and "lock-outs" furnish the following data, as given by Carroll D. Wright, United States Commissioner of Labor: "Strikes have occurred ever since 1741. From January 1, 1881, to June 30, 1894—thirteen-and-a-half years—there occurred strikes in 69,167 establishments, and lockouts in 6,067 establishments. There were thrown out of work by strikes 3,714,406 workmen; by lockouts, 366,690.

"The average duration of strikes was twenty-five days; of lockouts, forty-seven days. Forty-four and a half per cent of the strikes and forty and one-third per cent. of the lockouts were successful. Their demands were granted. Forty-four and one-half per cent. of the strikes and forty-seven and three-quarter per cent. of the lockouts failed of success.

"During these thirteen and one-half years [1881-1894] the loss to workmen by strikes was \$164,000,000; by lockouts, \$26,685,576, total \$190,492,382, or an average of \$44 to each workman.

"The loss to employers by strikes was \$82,500,000; by lockouts, \$12,235,000; total, \$94,735,000" (*Practical Sociology*, pp. 289-293).

While these figures tell the tremendous waste of resources, they cannot portray the suffering from mental anxiety and loss of lives.

Illustrating this last point is the statement of the *Christian Advocate* of December 22, 1904: "Between January 1, 1902, and June 30, 1904, 180 persons were killed in strikes in this country; 1,651 were injured and 5,533 were arrested. The following is the table of the killed, injured and arrested:

	Killed	Injured	Arrested
Non-union men .....	116	1366	374
Union strikers .....	51	151	5159
Officers .....	13	134	....
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total.....	180	1651	5533

Later: "During last July, August and September [1904] eighteen were killed, 315 injured, and 581 were arrested, making a total for two years and nine months of 198 killed, of whom 125 were non-union men, and 1,966 injured, of whom 1,626 were non-union men. The total number of arrested was 6,114, of whom 415 were non-union men, and 5,699 were union strikers."

From the frequent occurrence of strikes and lock-outs till now, costing the loss of lives and of millions of money on part of employers and employees, it is quite evident that organized self-defense cannot remedy the evils of social, industrial and political life.

Before leaving this point, the question of social and economical unjust discrimination because of sex, introduced above, merits a broader consideration under the head of

#### WOMAN'S DISADVANTAGE.

By their fall in Eden, man and woman lost complete harmony of spirit and poise of interests. Falling from union with God, they fell also from union with each other. Destined to complement each other (1 Cor. 11:11, 12), sin made them self-centred. And the man, being the stronger for leadership (Eph. 5:23), has gotten the better of the woman through perverted leadership.

To lead and yet not oppress is the unsolved problem. It is God-like. God leads Christ (John 12:50), but does not oppress Him: "The Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should



honor the Son even as they honor the Father" (John 5:23). This is the very opposite of oppression.

And that holy reciprocal relation between Christ and God is the pattern for woman's relation to man: "I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of every woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God" (1 Cor. 11:3). And to restore man to, and perfect him in, the Divine union in which each, without reserve, gives to the other his entire personality and possessions (John 16:15; 17:10), is accomplished through Christ's atonement: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me" (John 17:21-23). And apart from this experimental change in human nature, God's ideal for man and woman is impossible of realization.

Nevertheless, ignorant of this Divine provision or ignoring it, philosophers and philanthropists have, through the ages, tried by human wisdom to restore human society to normal condition.

A notable example of this was Plato's Republic [427 B. C.] with its common table of plain food for all citizens, rich and poor alike, supplied by the state. which owned and controlled, in birth and youthful training, and in occupation and marriage, every man and woman.

Another remarkable example was the *Utopia* of Sir Thomas More [1478-1535 A. D.] Its order was:

1. The community of goods.
2. The distribution of profits.



3. Forbidding the use of money and ostentation.
4. Taking meals in common.
5. Limiting labor to *six* hours a day.
6. All persons were laborers.

It differed from Plato's *Republic* (1) in there being no community of wives, (2) in the husband not owning his wife as chattel property.

In modern times very many have been the efforts [some say one hundred and forty] to bring society up to normal standard, but all have failed.

To find her under the greatest disadvantage we must see

#### WOMAN IN PAGANISM.

She was regarded as belonging to an order lower than man; as not having a soul like his; as not being immortal unless united to some man; as being an incarnation of evil; as being too impure for human sacrifice to the gods (cannibal Sandwich Islands); as chattel property of her husband to be used, sold or loaned; as incapable of improvement; as not owning her own person.

To all of these there are notable and some noble exceptions. Yet even Plato with his surpassing spiritual culture and moral insight still allowed man's assumed owning of woman as a chattel.

In Mahommedanism woman's condition is but little improved. She is regarded as by nature inferior to man; as a servant to satisfy his wants, prejudices, and desires; as disqualified for acts of public worship or entrance within the mosque. Morally as well as socially she is the property of her husband. The Koran fixes her rank subordinate to man: "Men are superior to women on account of the *qualities* with which God hath gifted the one above the other; and on account of the outlay *they make* from their substance *for them*" (Koran, Sura IV., verse 38).

When that most eminent of early Scotch missionaries, Dr. Alexander Duff, first landed in India in 1830, he was so struck with the abject condition of Hindu women that he, it is said, declared: "You might as well try to scale a wall 500 yards high as attempt female education in India."

Twenty-five years of faithful missionary effort broke the fetters from Hindu women; and *Zenana* education by heroic missionary women opened the way to the girls' school from which a few, daring derision and loss of friends, began to enter the high school and then the university.

Only twenty-eight years after the statement attributed to Dr. Duff, we have this record: "A native lady, Ayachee Ammal, sister of the honorary surgeon, Arokiam Pillay, of the Mysore service, has passed the matriculation examination, and is the first native lady who has passed in Bangalore.

Increasing hunger for higher education now spread rapidly among Hindu young women; and in the early eighties brilliant-minded young women began to surpass young men in university honors.

In 1882, "at the annual distribution of prizes at the Madras Medical College, one of the prize-takers was a young native lady from the Bombay Presidency, who carried away the first prize for materia medica, and the second prize for anatomy."

In 1884 Miss Chundra Mukhi Bose, B. A., had the degree of M. A. conferred upon her by the university.

In 1885 "*The Times of India*" gave this record: "Miss Avabai Merwanjee Bhowmuggree has creditably passed an examination at Cambridge. This is the first instance in which a Parsee lady has passed an examination at one of the seats of learning in England."

About the same time another Parsee young woman, Miss Cornelia Sorabjee, B. A., the first lady graduate

of the Bombay University, and daughter of Rev. Mr. Sorabjee [Church Missionary Society] has been appointed a Dukshna Fellow of the Gugurat College on rupees 100 [about \$50] *per mensem*.

The mother of this young lady is one of the most accomplished Hindu ladies. Her oratorical powers attracted large audiences in England during her recent visit to that country (*Eastern Star*). The foregoing cases have led the way for hundreds during the last twenty-five years

But high over all is the distinguished *Pandita Ramabai*. Among her earliest recollections is that of her mother teaching her *Sanscrit*. She committed to memory 20,000 verses of Hindu philosophy. She broke caste by mingling with other people, and further sinned by choosing her own husband. When professor of Sanscrit in Cheltenham College she accepted Christ (Condensed from Frances Willard).

In the classical languages, with several Hindu tongues, and a deep insight into the Scriptures, she is well equipped to furnish a pure and accurate translation of the Bible into Marathi. *Pundita* denotes her profound knowledge of philosophy as well as philology. For scholarship and philosophical research, it is a question whether Christianity in India can present her equal.

And better than all else, she is a profound teacher and a trustworthy witness of Christian Perfection set forth in the New Testament. Her immense orphanage is an industrial success and a marvel of spiritual triumph.

Woman in India, despite all disadvantages and disabilities of hoary custom and biased legislation, has proved herself the peer of man in India or elsewhere.

From Paganism in China there are similar trophies.

There are at least five young women who can repeat from memory the entire New Testament.

The distinguished Chinese surgeon of "acknowledged ability," Miss Mary Stone, M. D., graduated from the University of Michigan, is a noble example of the hundreds of young women in China, who break through every embargo to seize the rights of true womanhood. Dr. Stone has charge of the Elizabeth Skelton Danforth Memorial Hospital [100 or more beds] in Kiukiang, Central China.

And Japan will allow no peer in progress of woman. When the first college for women was opened, eight hundred young women, it is said, rushed into its halls.

Woman in Paganism has risen above every disadvantage, and proved herself the peer of man. In some points she excels him; and in some points he excels her. They are not identical, but equal—peers perfecting each other.

We may now consider some disadvantages of  
WOMAN IN CHRISTENDOM.

(1) Less than a hundred years ago a professing Christian might sell his wife! Dr. Dorchester gives an account of "A gentleman in this country, in 1815, having access to not a very large number of English sources of information, found in a single year thirty-nine instances of wives exposed to public sale, like cattle, at Smithfield" (Problem Religious Progress, p. 219).

On the same page he quotes a British periodical, "*The New Monthly Magazine*," for September, 1814, as follows: "Shropshire—A well-looking woman, wife of John Hall, to whom she had been married only one month, was brought by him in a halter, and sold by auction in the market, for two and sixpence, with the addition of sixpence for the rope with which she was led" (Our Country, p. 5).

Two things here are astonishing: first, that an Englishman should sell his wife; and secondly, that he should sell her so cheaply. As to the first, it must be understood of the lower class in abject poverty; and as to the second point, it seems evident that there was no demand for that kind of property. Mr. Hall received for his wife "two and sixpence," that is two shillings and sixpence—American money, about sixty-two and one-half cents. In that day it was not unusual for Englishmen of that low class to sell their wives into bondage.

But what is still more astonishing than all this, is the fact that Americans, not of a low, poverty-stricken class, but highly cultured, educated and wealthy, should sell wives! Wives of men whom they held in slavery, sometimes parting asunder mothers from their own children. And Americans continued to do this until the Proclamation of Abraham Lincoln, President of *the United States*, in 1863, abolished human slavery.

Out of the degradation of slavery, daughters of these freed men, by the thousands, have risen over poverty and prejudice, into notable womanhood and good scholarship.

Russian custom in the Seventeenth Century attests woman's degraded condition then in the Greek Catholic Church. Dr. Collins, physician to the Czar in 1670, declares: "The Russian custom to tie up wives by the hair and flogging them, begins to be left off."

(2) Woman's disadvantage in America is manifest in the following facts from Colonial times to the present:

In 1638 a few devout clergymen, "from dread of leaving an illiterate ministry in the churches," founded "Harvard College." But no provision was made for

common school education; much less was any thought given to the education of women. It was 153 years later [1791] before any provision was made for woman's common school education.

"Householders' School for Boys was established in Massachusetts in 1644, six years after the founding of Harvard College for clergymen; but it was 145 years [1789] before girls were allowed to enter even the primary school. Not until 1828, thirty-nine years later, were girls allowed in all the grades in the primary schools."

Woman continued to suffer many legislated disabilities, when Mrs. Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, in 1848, demanded the same privileges before the law as men had.

The unyielding grip of blind prejudice against womankind among legislators in that day is manifest in the following incident:

In 1848 our Government did not grant pensions to women whose husbands had given their lives for the nation. And "Mother" Bickerdyke, of the West, from that time forward for *eighteen* years, "gave her life to this work," when in 1866 the Government gave her a pension, but refused her all back-pension.

(3) When our public schools came into being, they were not meant for girls; the education of women being regarded as of little consequence. But she had from an early day a strong advocate in the heroic *Dr. Charles Elliott, LL.D.*, many years editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, Cincinnati, Ohio. He did much to bring about the founding of the Cincinnati Female College in 1850.

Among the objections strongly urged against woman's higher education, at that time, were: (1) "If educated, she will preach;" (2) She is physically disqualified to bear the strain."



That highly educated men as well as other people were bitterly opposed to higher education for women, the following incident shows, as related by Dr. E. O. Haven, professor in the University of Michigan in 1853: "I said the university ought to be open alike to men and women. A fellow professor declared that I was 'crazy.' But in *sixteen* years I saw that university opened to women by the legislature."

When Vassar College was opened, a prominent woman voiced the general feeling when she said: "The mere fact that it is called a college for women, is enough to condemn it. Of one thing we may be sure, no refined, Christian mother will ever send her daughter to Vassar College."

See, that "prominent woman" thought very erroneously that the daughter of a "refined, Christian mother" would sacrifice her refinement—womanly modesty, and become somewhat coarse, "mannish," if she obtained a college education.

(4) At the present time the younger people can form no conception of the intensity and the breadth of the disadvantages imposed upon women of the past generation. The writer recalls the day when only men and boys drove a team of horses, and for a woman to drive out in a buggy, was to press the limit of modesty and seem "mannish." Strange as it now appears, yet, in the past, modesty and immodesty, even right and wrong, have, in some measure, been matters of mere custom, without reason or religion.

"In Texas a husband can sell everything, regardless of his wife's protest. He can collect her bank account—money she may have earned outside the home. This is so in some other states" (L. J. Terry, *Woman's National Daily*, January 20, 1911).

The average yearly earnings of men is given at \$513;

of women, \$213. Colorado shows an average for men of \$638; for women, \$554.

(5) Among school teachers, a like discrimination is made against women. Hon. W. T. Harris, United States Commissioner of Education, gives statistics of Barnstable County, Massachusetts, as follows:

In 1840 men were paid per month, \$20.28; women, \$6.14.

In 1860 men were paid per month, \$40.73; women, \$19.12.

In 1866 men were paid per month, \$53.60; women, \$22.53.

In 1890 men were paid per month, \$68.18; women, \$34.88.

Why is a man paid *twice* the salary that a woman receives? That, too, when all admit that she is the better teacher of children. Hence more than *two-thirds* of the teachers of common schools are women.

Can any reason be given for this marked discrimination against woman respecting remuneration for services? For shelter, food, and clothing, she pays fully as much as a man pays. And her education costs fully as much.

The same is true of manufacturing establishments. For work as clerks, men are paid an average of \$890; women, \$462.

As operatives in mechanical and manufacturing industries, the earnings of men average \$498 *per annum*; of women, \$276 (Census of 1890).

(6) United States Ex-Commissioner of Labor, Carroll D. Wright, LL.D., giving reasons why so low wages are paid women, says: "She has been under social, political, and intellectual subjection for centuries, and only recently has she been winning justice and recognition" (Outlines of Practical Sociology, p. 216).

The beginning of the Nineteenth Century marks a

general revolution in public opinion respecting woman's rank and destiny. And by the middle of the century, her right to all privileges of education enjoyed by men, was achieved and generally acknowledged. And toward the end of the century all occupations were opened to her. In 1852 only *seven* occupations were open to women; but in 1892 over *four hundred* had already been actually entered.

At the beginning of the Nineteenth Century it was thought rather "mannish" for a woman to teach a public school, because men only had been doing that; but by 1890 there were 246,066 women teaching in public schools, in colleges, and in universities. Over *two-thirds* of all teachers were women. And "in New England more than *ninety-one* per cent. are women" (U. S. Census, 1890).

In 1895 there were over 451 colleges and universities in this country. Of this number, 310 were co-educational—open alike to men and women; and 143 were colleges for women only. And nearly all the great universities of Europe were already opened to women. There are now [1910] 345 colleges and universities admitting men and women, and 162 colleges for women only.

#### POINTS OF PROGRESS AND WOMEN OF SPECIAL HONORS.

Mrs. Ella Flagg Young, Ph.D., LL.D., surviving the combat with woman's disadvantages, declares: "This world is not an easy place for a woman." She is superintendent of the schools of Chicago, on a salary of \$10,000 a year.

Professor Rena A. Michaels, A.M., Ph.D., Dean of the Woman's College of the Northwestern University, has made her position a pronounced success.

She is most esteemed and active member of the American Association of Modern Languages.

In 1909 Mrs. Lillian Mullen, of Walnut Hills, was awarded the highest honors in embalming at a state examination in which *forty-eight* men competed.

In 1896 full suffrage was granted to women in Utah and Idaho. Wyoming, Colorado and Washington likewise grant to women national suffrage.

In 1898 women in Ireland were given the right to vote for all offices except Parliament. "The state of Delaware gave the right of school-suffrage to all tax-paying women." And in 1900 Minnesota gave school suffrage to women, while West Australia granted full parliamentary suffrage to women, married or single.

In 1901 Norway granted full parliamentary suffrage to women. In 1902 full national suffrage was granted to all women of Federated Australia and state suffrage to the women of New South Wales, and 1903 dates the gift of full state-suffrage to all women of Tasmania. And now English women, in augmenting numbers, are making unceasing and determined efforts to secure the right of parliament suffrage for women in Great Britain.

All this does not reflect honor upon the United States for slow recognition of personal rights of women, notwithstanding our matchless wealth and acknowledged superior genius for invention and discovery.

On the rights of married women we have been slow to lift from them grievous disadvantages and burdens wrongfully imposed. Before 1871 married women had no legal right to their own earnings! Why? "It took *eleven* years to get laws permitting women to own the garments they wore!" A wife's labor was unrecognized. It is somewhat so still. The carpenter or bricklayer is paid from \$2 to \$5 a day; the housekeeper for

cooking, cleaning, washing, sewing and mending, etc., etc., is paid from \$2 to \$5 a *week*.

Yet, in spite of universal depreciation and debasement by the ruling sex, woman has suffered and wrought and reasoned her way into recognition as an intellectual, industrial, political, and religious factor, equal to man in solving the problems of Christian civilization.

This case will be stronger with the adding of a few more instances of note, and women of fame.

"The original Declaration of Independence was printed by Mary Katharine Goddard, editor of '*The Gazette*.'"

"Margaret Draper, of Boston, conducted the first newspaper in the United States."

"Artificial marble is the invention of Madame Dutillet."

"Miss Lucy Johnson invented the seamless bag in 1824, out of which others made a fortune."

"The finest Swiss-made watches are by women; and the largest flax mill in Europe is owned by a woman."

"The largest foundry in Troy, N. Y., manufactures a horseshoe every *three* seconds, with a machine invented by a woman."

"The invention of the cotton-gin is due to a woman, Mrs. Green; but the patent was issued in the name of Eli Whitney. This invention has revolutionized the industries of the world" (*Daughters of America*, pp. 643-653).

As a sculptor, Harriet Hosmer became celebrated. And the colossal statue on the dome of the new state-house at Madison, Wisconsin, was designed and executed by a woman, Helen F. Mears.

From *one to three thousand* women are lawyers. *One thousand* of these are in America. "One of these women, fifteen years ago, was a servant in the family

of an Iowa farmer at \$1.25 a week. To-day her income as a patent attorney is \$10,000 a year (*Christian Standard*, July, 1910).

"Mrs. May G. Bellamy was chosen a member of the House of Representatives, state of Wyoming, at the last election (1910)—the first woman given this honor since Wyoming granted suffrage to women in 1869. About a score of women in other woman-enfranchised states have been members of the legislature, and one a member of the state senate" (*Woman's Journal*, January 21, 1911).

As journalists and writers, woman's success is a matter of universal knowledge. Only the other day, Miss Florence A. Lincoln, of Radcliffe College, graduated from the Boston Normal School, at the head of her class; in 1906, excelled Harvard men, sixteen in number, and five other Radcliffe girls, for the Craig prize of \$250 for dramatic composition (*W. C. A.*, January 25, 1911).

The medical profession records woman's success in *materia medica* and in surgery.

"No fewer than 698 lady doctors have been graduated from the Medical Academy for Women at St. Petersburg. There are 700 women practicing medicine in Russia." This is the record for 1894. And in 1892 there were about 150 registered and practicing physicians in Great Britain.

In the United States there are, it is said, 9,000 women who are physicians and surgeons. "The noted surgeon of the St. Louis, Brownsville and Mexico Railway is Dr. Sophie Herzog. When this railway was building, times were exciting, as evidenced by a necklace of twenty-three bullets, each one of which was extracted from a wounded man by Dr. Herzog herself; twenty-two of the men are living testimony of her skill" (*Cleveland Press*, January 20, 1911).



Dr. Yamei Kin, the most distinguished woman in China, is Principal of Imperial Pei-Yang Woman's Medical School and Dispensary at Tien-Tsin. She speaks nine Chinese dialects, and Japanese and English.

Now we have 9,000 women as physicians. But fifty-eight years ago [1842] the prejudice was such that no landlord in New York would rent rooms to Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, who had just taken her M. D. She was compelled to buy a house to begin practice.

Big must be written on the roll of honor the name of Mrs. Lucy Webb Hayes, first in moral courage among the wives of the national Presidents. In harmony with the wish of President Rutherford B. Hayes, she banished intoxicating liquors from the Presidential table, albeit the public press alleged that it showed disrespect to the ambassadors and the ministers representing other nations; that it would provoke war with foreign powers; that it was a disregard for national custom, etc.

But she was from Ohio, where the anti-saloon *crusade* was born, and could read the moral sentiment of the nation, which by her heroic action was greatly strengthened.

Statuary Hall in the capitol at Washington is honored by the statue of Miss Frances E. Willard, first president of the American Woman's Christian Temperance Union, also first president of the World's W. C. T. U. By her purity and force of character and by her genius for organization, she with her associates, did more to secure municipal and state legislation to ennoble manhood and exalt womanhood than did any other person.

Another distinguished woman is Miss Clara Barton, "the Florence Nightingale of America." During the Civil War her work for the sick and the wounded won

for her the title, "Angel of the Battlefield." Florence Nightingale achieved immortal fame by deeds of heroism in the Crimean War. But Clara Barton led the van of relief in our Civil War and also served with distinction in the Franco-Prussian War, in the Spanish-American War, and in the Russo-Japanese War. Through her efforts the constitution of the Red Cross Society was altered to grant aid to the sufferers under calamities of peace. So she was a benediction in Armenian massacres, Russian famine, and earthquakes in Italy and San Francisco.

Diplomas and decorations of honor have been awarded her by Germany, Armenia, Austria, Sweden, Servia, Switzerland, Turkey, Spain and Russia. Many other women of the W. C. T. U. merit honorable mention, but space forbids.

For superior scholarship and great learning, two notable cases merit mention: (1) "Mrs. Bryant has taken the degree of Doctor of Science at the University of London . . . This is by far the most severe test of philosophical scholarship, so far as range of subject is concerned, in England. The great difficulty of the examination is seen in the fact that, though it has been in existence a good number of years, it has been passed only once before. The fortunate candidate on that occasion was a Hindu gentleman" (*Indian Mirror*, 1884).

(2) "Miss Amelia B. Edwards, Ph.D., L. H. D., LL.D., is with reason called 'the most learned lady in the world.' Her valued labors in the field of Egyptology, in addition to her varied labors in the realm of general literature, have had their recognition in America as well as in Great Britain and Europe. American colleges have given her honorary degrees, and American scholars have accorded her unstinted praise for the admirable work done by her in various departments

of learning. A visit from Miss Edwards to America is, therefore, an event of special importance . . . Miss Edwards has held the attention of crowded audiences in the great cities as well as university centres of England and Scotland, upon Egyptian, Græco-Egyptian, and Biblical-Egyptian subjects; and she is said to relate the stirring story of Egyptian exploration with a vividness which makes those faraway subjects as interesting as a sensational romance" (India Witness, 1889).

The significance of these two cases, in large measure, lies in the fact that these two women were securing their education when the general prejudice against woman's higher education, in Europe and America, was intense.

Once more. We have seen woman succeed as an inventor. A few examples of her success in the realm of discovery will be pleasing:

(1) "Madame Curie, co-discoverer of *radium*, has been promoted to full professorship in the University of Paris. A woman who can discover new truth is certainly qualified to teach it; and the young men in the university can afford to sit with respect at the feet of this remarkable woman of science."

(2) "Mrs. Elizabeth Preston Brown Davis, who has calculated the ephemeris of the sun for the Nautical Almanac office for several years . . . has resigned a \$1,200 position under Professor Simon Newcomb, which she won by a competitive examination in a large class of men, she being the only woman . . . Since Mrs. Davis has lived in Los Angeles she has done a good deal of work for Professor Barnard of the Lick Observatory. She calculates the orbits of all the new comets discovered by Professors Newcomb and Barnard . . . She invented the Washington-Greenwich table now used in the Nautical Almanac office. She

has two children" (Washington Public Service, 1893).

(3) Miss Maria Mitchell, noted astronomer and distinguished professor of astronomy at Vassar College, in 1847 discovered a comet, for which she received a gold medal from the King of Denmark . . . The degree of LL.D. was conferred upon her by Hanover and also by Columbia University.

(4) Best of all, from the standpoint of discovery. Mrs. Wilhelmina Fleming is easily the foremost astronomer of the world.

"Of the *seventeen* new suns discovered during the past twenty-five years, *Mrs. Wilhelmina Fleming*, of Harvard, found ten. During the past year (1910), she discovered two—one on October 1, and one on October 13.

"A third new sun was discovered by another woman at the Harvard Observatory, Miss E. J. Cannon. The date of her discovery was November 11, 1910."

"Up to within the last few days of the year, it looked as if American women held supreme honors for the year in exploring the skies; but on the evening of December 30, Dr. Espin of England found a new sun. He cabled the discovery to Harvard Observatory. The women there—there are fifteen of them—hurried to the camera plates, told him about it, etc. Miss Leavitt of Harvard found one new sun in her lifetime, and Miss Cannon discovered another. Thus, of seventeen new suns found in the last quarter century, these three American women have found thirteen. Male scientists have found four" (Toledo News-Bee, January 5, 1911).

#### LAX ENFORCEMENT OF LAW.

Another great obstacle to realizing Christ in government is this laxness in enforcing wholesome laws.

There is lack of aptness to see this. This lack comes of a general deterioration in character, caused by the criminal neglect to enforce moral obligation in the state, and back of that, religious obligation in the churches.

"During the last two years [1908-1910] there were forty-two trials of conspicuous offenders. One was a prominent political 'boss'; others were mayors, treasurers and aldermen.

"Of the forty-two indicted, twenty-seven were convicted, but not one met his penalty. Seven left the country, and eight regained much of their former prestige" (Christian Herald, October 14, 1910).

"Governor Patterson of Tennessee pardoned the noted criminal, the elder ———, placing himself above jury and supreme court, and turned loose a hardened, red-handed murderer. Over one hundred murderers are at large in Tennessee, with his approval. And scores of violators of the liquor laws have been set free" (Richmond Christian Advocate).

These melancholy facts are given to justify the following drastic statements:

"Dr. Andrew White, ex-President of Cornell University and former ambassador to Germany, in his address at Ithaca, N. Y., said that in the United States the average criminal serves but seven years of his life-sentence; and only one murderer in seventy-four is punished" . . . "The number of felonious homicides per million of population for various countries is: Canada, three; Germany, four to five; England and Wales, ten to eleven; France, fourteen to fifteen; Belgium, sixteen; United States, 129. These are averages for eight years." . . . "The administration of criminal law has become simply a game between two or three lawyers; and the whole thing has become a farce."

Secretary Taft [now President, U. S. A.] declared in his recent address at Yale University, that "the administration of the criminal laws of this country is a disgrace; and that the lax manner of their enforcement encourages the committing of crime."

"There has been during the past twenty years [1885-1904] an enormous decrease of executions as compared with the total number of murders. Briefly stated, since 1885, in this country there have been 131,951 murders and homicides, and only 2,286 executions and 2,920 lynchings" (New Voice). The 634 lynchings in excess of executions, indicates the general distrust concerning the enforcement of law.

These ominous facts are given to show the magnitude of the problem of enthroning Christ in government—our only hope (Acts 3:22, 23).

#### WRONG OPINIONS.

Another and strong barrier against accepting Christ in government, is the erroneous opinions of prominent men. (1) Concerning government: The eminent Lord Wellesley declared that: "War is the means whereby nations are made. The vast domain of Britain has been built by the sword."

Dr. J. M. Buckley, (editor of *The Christian Advocate*), curtly retorts: "That sentiment is suited to the Dark Ages."

And the distinguished Field Marshal of Germany, Count von Moltke, declared to Professor Blunchli, instructor of international law, December 11, 1880: "Eternal peace is a dream . . . War is a component part in the fixed order of the universe established by God Himself. It develops man's noblest virtues of courage and renunciation, faithfulness to duty and readiness for self-sacrifice. Were it not for war, the



world would become bemired in materialism" (McClure's Magazine, May, 1910).

"April 24, 1877, he declared to the Reichstag: 'Gentlemen, I share the hope and wish of the orator, for a lasting peace; but I do not share his confidence. But, gentlemen, this lasting peace is prevented by mutual distrust, and in this distrust lies our greatest danger. Mutual distrust is what keeps the nations in arms against one another . . . All nations stand equally in need of peace'" (McClure's Magazine, November, 1910).

The distinguished count affirms a basal truth in saying: "Mutual distrust is what keeps the nations in arms against one another." But when he says: "War is a component part in the fixed order of the universe, established by God Himself," he says that "mutual distrust" at the foundation of war, is a "component part in the fixed order of the universe, established by God Himself!" What a theodicy! What an estimate of God's character!

The war sentiment of the famous field marshal is so contrary to the word of God, which declares: "The Lord is righteous in all His ways, and holy in all His works" (Psa. 145:17).

How Count von Moltke's sentiment differs from that of the distinguished General W. T. Sherman, who said to some soldiers, commenting on war, "Boys, it's all hell!"

And how it contrasts with the sentiment of that noble American patriot, General Nelson A. Miles: "War is a crime against humanity—abhorrent to intelligence."

Right views of God and Biblical views of sin and of its remedy, are antecedent and indispensable to Christ in government.

Christian nations, generally—Germany in particular

—have held the soldier-occupation in highest honor. But the trade of killing men by wholesale is rapidly falling in rank of honor. It no longer stands first.

The order in China is fast gaining influence. Intelligence is the chief aristocracy. The order is (1) the scholar; (2) the farmer; (3) the mechanic; (4) the merchant; (5) the soldier. The first three are productive; the fourth, distributive; the fifth and lowest is destructive—rightly the lowest. The first four are constructive, based on confidence and love; the last is destructive, based on distrust and hatred.

In economic genius and moral insight, China is favorably circumstanced for early readiness to enthrone Christ in government.

(2) Another obstacle—perhaps the greatest—preventing the realization of Christ in government according to the gospel, is the wrong opinions of the gospel generally held by the clergy and the people at large: (a) Fragmentary and superficial views of the gospel. This is strongly expressed in the Episcopal address at the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church [1896]: "It cannot be too deeply impressed upon our minds that in all ages the church has fallen far short of the Divine ideal, both in purity and power. God's thought and plans for His Church are as high above ours as the heavens are above the earth. . . . When we look at His ideal, promise, provision, and power, at the humiliation and exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ, at the unwordable groanings of the Holy Spirit, it seems as if provision and performance were scarcely at all related."

An illustration of this superficial view of the gospel is "a meeting of New York clergymen . . . There were about a dozen present, and among them were men of national and international reputation and influence. One of the leaders expressed his perplexity

and regret that he could not find in the teachings of Jesus any social laws! And what is still more surprising, the statement passed unchallenged; so completely had leaders of thought lost sight of the social aspects of Christianity" (Next Great Awakening, p. 118).

(b) Erroneous views of the gospel are insurmountable obstacles in the way of apprehending Christ in government. They preclude the personal experience that affords the aptitude for it. An instance of this is the following statement:

"The doctrine of the Trinity is not the gospel; nor is it the foundation of the gospel . . . The question is one of metaphysics. It is not a question of religion" (Gospel for an Age of Doubt, p. 113).

Surprising statement! Its fallacy is equalled only by the reputation of its author. How it pales in face of Christ's commission to baptize all nations "in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28:19).

This baptismal covenant with the Holy Trinity surely is the content and "foundation of the gospel" (Rom. 6; 3, 4; Col. 2: 11, 12). Just as circumcision was basal in Judaism, baptism in the Holy Trinity is fundamental in the gospel.

Most true are the words of that "prince of exegetes," Dr. A. W. Meyer: "The Trinity is the point in which all Christian ideas, and interests unite; at once the beginning and the end of all insight into Christianity" (Lehre von der Trinitaet, Vol. I., p. 42).

And the eminent Presbyterian theologian of Princeton, Dr. C. Hodge, declares the Trinity: "The doctrine that determines the religious experience of believers" (Systematic Theology, Vol. I., p. 442).

And the world-renowned reformer, John Wesley, declares: "The knowledge of the Three-One God is

interwoven with all true Christian faith" (Sermons, Vol. II., p. 24).

These three great exegetes find that the Trinity is "the foundation of the gospel," is "a question of religion."

Other erroneous views likewise obstruct the way of faith and progress toward the goal of Christ in government; (1) such as substituting service for faith in order to salvation; whereas, "by grace are ye saved *through faith* . . . Not of works . . . For ye are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus *unto good works*" (Eph. 2:8-10); "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. 4:5); (2) The fallacy of attempting acceptable service to God, on a time-limit, "to live for the next *two weeks* as Jesus would," etc.; whereas no Divine grace is possible on a time-limit of human device (John 15:6, 7); (3) The baneful error of regarding the gospel as a scheme to take people to heaven in order to save them, instead of saving them here in order to establish the kingdom of God on earth (Matt. 4:17; Luke 9:2, 6; 16:16; 17:20, 21).

This baneful error being the direct opposite to God's plan, its tendency is to sin and spiritual death. Professor R. T. Ely, Ph.D., LL.D., rightly observes: "I believe it is a common impression that Christianity is concerned primarily with a future state of existence; and to this unfortunate error I trace the alliance between the Church and the powers of this world" (Social Aspects of Christianity, p. 53).

Having considered the disadvantages and the hindrances to the inauguration of Christ in government, let us now view this subject in its

#### CONSTRUCTIVE FACTORS.

1. *Co-operative Profit-Sharing*—This implies co-

partnership of interests. The employer and the employee are associates. Capital and labor interlock; the one complements the other. Neither outranks the other in honor. Mutual confidence and reciprocal effort characterize all parties concerned. Invested money and rendered service have just reward. Fidelity excludes suspicion, and harmony slays anarchy. Character is exalted, and business becomes a school of morals.

Co-operative profit-sharing; in "giving employees a money interest in the business, brings out the best moral elements of the capitalist and of the workman. This system has been tried many times, and usually with success" (Wright, *Practical Sociology*, p. 281). The Herr Krupp great gun factory at Essen, Prussia, has practiced profit-sharing with satisfaction for many years.

Professor R. T. Ely, LL.D., says: "A member of a firm having distributed more than \$100,000 of profits among their employees, writes that he and his partner consider it the best investment they ever made" (*Outlines Econom.*, p. 199). "The United States Steel Corporation, January 1, 1911, gave \$2,700,000 bonuses, against \$2,000,000 January 1, 1910, for efficiency and punctuality." The International Harvester, Chicago, January 1, 1911, gave their men \$500,000 as profit-sharing adopted years ago. The men may take the money or put it in as stock. Likewise the M. Gadin Works in Guise, France: "In this large manufacturing establishment, trustworthy working men now manage the entire business" (Ely, *Outlines Econom.*, p. 200).

This system of profit and capital sharing proving so great a success in Europe, is rapidly gaining favor with large business firms in the United States. Among its benefits are: (1) The workman receives larger com-

pensation for his skill; (2) The capitalist gets better remuneration for his money; (3) The moral tone of the entire community is elevated; for "strikes" at best are demoralizing.

2, *Arbitration*—This is, (1) industrial, (2) political, (3) international. Voluntary arbitration indicates human progress. To settle party differences with a bludgeon denotes barbarism; to settle them by war—a skillful way of killing men by wholesale—denotes *educated* barbarism; to settle them by voluntary arbitration, denotes civilization. Only in high civilization do we meet real altruism—proper consideration of our fellow-man.

Having already considered industrial arbitration, let us pass on to the study of political and international arbitration.

Voluntary arbitration comes of the operation of moral forces. We are coming to see that moral force outranks all other forces. This is true psychologically: "The intellectual rises above the physical; the moral, above the intellectual, and claims that the understanding shall be obedient to it" (Dr. McCosh, *Christianity and Positivism*, p. 54). And it must become so historically.

This welcome consummation was forecast fifty years ago by the great American statesman, *Charles Sumner*: "When the national example will be more puissant than army or navy for the conquest of the world."

It was this and direct moral force wielded by the President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, at the Portsmouth peace council of the foremost diplomats of Russia and of Japan, that brought to an end the war between those two great nations.

To all under the control of physical, brute force, international arbitration looks like a confession of na-



tional incompetency. They do not see that even between parties of strong high moral character mistakes in judgment are possible, and may cause irreconcilable differences, as in the case of Barnabas and Saul (Acts 13: 2-4), concerning the servant Mark (Acts 11: 24; 15:36-39); and, likewise, in the case of John Wesley and Jonathan Edwards concerning Calvinism.

The United States and Great Britain are in evidence: "Within the last two years nine disputes of long standing between Canada and the United States have been amicably settled, including the boundary waters and the Newfoundland fisheries, two disputes which almost precipitated war."

Up to the present time there have been nearly three hundred cases of amicable settlement, by arbitration, of questions between different nations. But in all these cases, the point in dispute was one of property or industry. The question of honor was excepted, although remotely it seemed involved.

But a new era has dawned. The great steel magnate, *Andrew Carnegie*, has given \$10,000,000 as a foundation to secure universal peace among nations. Viewing the questions from the financial standpoint, he says: "The mad preparations for war all over the world are increasing the cost of living. The cost of armies and navies for 1910 was tremendous. To Great Britain the cost was \$315,000,000; to Germany, \$287,000,000; to Russia, \$281,000,000; to the United States, \$262,000,000; to France, \$227,000,000; to Japan, \$95,000,000; to Italy, \$84,000,000. And these figures do not include the enormous cost of pensions. In the United States the total expense overtops \$400,000,000."

The well-known French economist, Edmund Thery, says: "The armed peace of Europe, of the last twenty-five years, has cost \$29,000,000,000 . . . Much of

it has been paid to keep 4,000,000 men out of all kinds of productive industry."

On the far-reaching influence of our enormous waste of money, in view of war, Mr. Carnegie says: "The commercial exchanges annually exceed \$25,000,000,000 in value, and are constantly increasing. The nations are partners in this enormous traffic. Why should any two be permitted to go to war and thus disturb this world-commerce in which we all are interested? Every nation has a stake in the world's peace, and a partner has a right to insist that should disputes arise these must be amicably settled."

The chief hindrance to an international compact securing universal peace, has been the unwillingness to submit to a court of arbitration questions of national honor as well as questions of property and finance.

On this point President W. H. Taft, in his address before the Peace and Arbitration Society in New York last March [1910], said: "I have noticed exception, in our arbitration treaties, as to reference of questions of national honor to courts of arbitration.

"Personally, I do not see any more reason why matters of national honor should not be referred to a court of arbitration than matters of property or of national proprietorship . . . I do not see why a question of honor may not be submitted to a tribunal composed of men of honor who understand questions of national honor, as well as any other question of difference arising between nations."

In this, President Taft is the first among the rulers of the great world-powers to take this position. But smaller nations have the honor of first establishing absolute peace. The South American republics of Chili and Argentina first established unqualified international peace, and placed on their boundary line on the top of the Andes a colossal statue of the *Galilean*

*Prince of Peace.* Sweden and Norway have followed their example; so have Belgium and Holland.

And if the United States Congress will enact a law, as recommended in President Taft's message, providing for the appointment of a commission of five members "to be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace,"—if the United States Congress enacts such a law, other world-powers will do the same, and Mr. Carnegie's forecast will surely come to pass: "Young men of this generation are to see the civilized world under the reign of peace."

Mutual distrust lies at the foundation of the unwillingness to freely submit all questions of dispute to a competent court of international arbitration. And at the foundation of this mutual distrust among the nations is the lack of trustworthy character.

And in the absence of this trustworthy character, nations have reserved the privilege to be their own judges of what is right. For self-protection they have done this, and "self-protection is the first law of life." Then, under the circumstances, they have been doing what is right. But in doing this, they have been adopting a principle at variance with civic justice, that of sitting in judgment on their own cause. The words of Mr. Carnegie are true and forcible: "The obstacle in our path hitherto has been the desire of nations *to sit in judgment in their own cause, a practice which would condemn any judge to infamy.* No nation should do so. The man who sits in judgment in his own case, violates the first principle of natural justice and is dishonored."

Politicians are bewildered; and statesmen are in a dilemma. Under present circumstances of common international distrust, each nation will be its own judge as to what is right respecting other nations, a course at variance with the first principles of justice and morality in community. *A principle that is morally wrong between individuals, is morally wrong also between communities and nations.*

Forcible on this point is the statement in the address of Ex-President Roosevelt, delivered at the Sorbonne, Paris, in April 1910: "I do not for one moment admit that political morality is different from private morality; that a promise made on the stump differs from a promise made in private life. I do not for one moment admit that a man should act deceitfully as a public servant in his dealings with other nations, any more than that he should act deceitfully in his dealings as a private citizen with other private citizens; *I do not for one moment admit that a nation should treat other nations in a different spirit from that in which an honorable man would treat other men.*"

But all right-thinking men, statesmen or theologians, are agreed on one point; namely, that the only hope of nations is Christ.

Accordingly the United States Congress, September 11, 1777, voted to import 20,000 Bibles, and recommended the "Legislature to take the most urgent measures for the encouragement of true religion."

Dr. Gregory rightly declares: "Duty toward God requires of the State that it should actually conform its conduct to the will of God as the immutable law of right" (Ethics, p. 306). Dr. C. Hodge enforces the same sentiment: "A civil government cannot ignore religion any more than physiology. It was not constituted to teach either the one or the other; but it

must, by a like necessity, conform its action to the laws of both." (Ethics, p. 342).

The English biologist, Prof. Huxley, member of the London School Board in 1882, voted to retain the Bible in the schools of London, saying: "I know not how we can maintain the *religious sentiment which is the basis of all right action*, in the present chaotic state of opinion on these matters, without the use of the Bible."

Ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, in his address at Berlin, Germany, in May 1910, declared: "We can well do without the hard intolerance and intellectual barrenness of what was worst in the theological systems of the past, but there has never been greater need of a high and fine religious spirit than at the present time."

The French statesman, Monsieur de Tocqueville, has well said: "It is religion that has given rise to the Anglo-American communities."

An elder and foremost statesman of Japan, Count Okuma, in his address at Commencement of Aoyama College, 1910, said: "I believe that Christianity is the most advanced form of civilization. There is a possibility, I think, that the centre of civilization will come round to the Far East when this advanced religion [Christianity] has rightly been interwoven into the thought of the nation, and the nation has progressed with the times.

"I believe that any nation that makes antiquated faith its state religion will soon cease to exist. Therefore I hope that you will endeavor to live up to the teachings of Christ."

Another great statesman of Japan, ex-member of the Imperial Cabinet, *Baron Maejima*, declared recently: "I firmly believe that we must have religion at the basis of our national and personal welfare. No

matter how large an army or navy we may have, unless we have righteousness at the foundation of our national existence, we shall fall short of the highest success.

"I do not hesitate to say that we must rely upon religion for our highest welfare. And when I look about me to see what religion we can best rely on, I am convinced that the religion of Christ is the most full of strength and promise for the nation."

On this point of Christ the final and only satisfying hope of nations, Count Okuma, of Japan, quoted before, says: "The efforts which Christians are making to supply to the country a high standard of conduct, are welcomed by all right-thinking people.

"As you read your Bible you may think it antiquated—out of date. The words it contains may so appear; but the noble life which it holds up to admiration is something that will never be out of date, however much the world may progress.

"Live and preach this life; and you will supply the nation just what it needs at the present juncture."

As the sun rises to rule the day, Christ, the "Sun of Righteousness," comes to rule the world. And all nations are now seeing this—some the daylight, others the dawn. This is the power that works for righteousness. And nations have survived or sunk to ruin as they have obeyed or disdained that Power. While "evil men and seducers [individual or national] shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived" (2 Tim. 3:13), the world grows better (Isa. 11:9, 10; Hab. 2:14).

In testimony, Professor Lieber declares: "The morals of the Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries were of a most licentious character. Whoever is least acquainted with the morals of those ages . . . will consider the advance of morality in our race dur-



ing the last two centuries—despite all existing irregularities—as one of the most signal traits in modern history” (Political Ethics, Vol. II., p. 134).

In the progress of mankind from savage to civilized conditions, at every stage of new development and surviving all other obstacles, has been, and is, the crowning obstacle in man himself—his sinful nature, or “sin in the flesh” (Rom. 8:3). God declares: “The mind of the flesh [old man.—Rom. 6:6; Eph. 4:22] is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be” (Rom. 8:7).

While all constructive forces, noted above, have improved man’s condition, and effected a gradual approach toward individual and national perfection, that God-appointed goal has not been reached; nor can it be, in man’s sinful condition. This brings us to consider our final point in this problem.

#### CHRIST IN GOVERNMENT ACCOMPLISHED.

To have Christ in government an accomplished fact in history, God has been preparing the nations. Every new step in advance seems taken with a view to something more to come. In fact, there is in historic providence no isolated event. Progress among the nations in the near past, and now, has no parallel.

The absolute sovereigns of Japan, China, Turkey, and Russia granting to their subjects constitutional government; and the civic reform and labor-exalting among other nations, mark the beginning of a new era.

On this long disturbing question of “capital and labor,” the greatest of modern statesmen, *Abraham Lincoln*, held sound views endorsed recently by Ex-President Roosevelt: “I hold that while man exists, it is his duty to improve, not only his own condition, but to assist in ameliorating mankind . . . labor is prior to, and independent of, capital; capital is only

the fruit of labor. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves the higher consideration. Capital has its rights which are as worthy of protection as any other rights . . . Nor should this lead to war upon the owners of property. Property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. Let not him who is homeless, pull down the house of another; but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example showing that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

The industrial, political and commercial progress of the nations is wonderful; and, among them all, the United States is foremost in political influence and wealth.

(1) The leadership of the United States in ending war and securing international peace, has been highly acknowledged: The *Grashdamin* [Russian], September 3, 1905, says: "With the advent of peace as the result of the *Portsmouth* Conference, European diplomacy steps back to give place to the practical, sound, common-sense diplomacy exemplified by President Roosevelt."

And Emperor William II., of Germany, declared: "President Roosevelt alone deserves credit for bringing about peace. He was the only man in the world who could have done it. He did his part splendidly."

And the Mikado of Japan, on September 3, 1905, issued the following acknowledgment: "The President—I have received with gratification your message conveyed through our plenipotentiaries, and thank you warmly for it.

"To your disinterested and unremitting efforts in the interests of peace and humanity I attach the high value which is their due, and assure you of my grateful appreciation of the distinguished part you have taken in the establishment of peace based upon prin-

ciples essential to the permanent welfare and tranquility of the Far East—Mutsuhito.”

The high personal character and the great diplomatic ability of the then Secretary of State, Mr. John Hay, is a matter of common knowledge. He did much to bring peace.

The advanced international peace sentiment of the government at Washington had notably causal antecedents. Dr. Channing styled “a battlefield a vast exhibition of crime; a more fearful hell in any region of the universe cannot well be conceived.”

ETHICS—49

Senator Charles Sumner called war “international lynch law with mark infinitely evil and accursed.” And he said: “The greatest value of the Springfield Arsenal was that it inspired Longfellow’s poem against war.”

And Theodore Parker wrote: “Posterity will damn into deep infamy that government which allows a war to take place in the midst of the *Nineteenth Century*.”

British philanthropists have expressed like sentiment.

(2) The wealth of the United States far exceeds that of other nations. A few data will show this. And this also gives the United States international responsibility far above other nations.

A few data: The bank deposits have been stated as follows, “The United States, \$418.89 per capita; Canada, \$289.14; Hungary, \$251.91; Japan, \$5.48.

“In 1900, sixty-one banks had on deposit \$824,823,114. and up to 1910 gained 112 per cent.; capital stock had increased 164 per cent.; surplus undivided profits had increased 160 per cent” (Chicago Banker, October 22, 1910).

The Wall Street Journal [1910] gave 793 trusts

with aggregate capital, \$1,400,000,000 reporting daily increase of \$10,000,000.

In 1910 the farms were valued at \$25,000,000,000, producing annually \$8,000,000,000. The cereals alone in 1909 equaled \$3,000,000,000, that is more than \$29,000,000 for each working day of the year (Secretary Wilson).

For the year ending June 30, 1910, the operating expenses of all the railroads in the United States aggregated \$1,847,189,773.03; operating income, \$2,787,266,136.64, which equals *three* times the income of the United States from all sources. The total earnings of all railroads in the country, above operating expenses, were \$940,076,361.61, exceeding the earnings of 1909 by nearly \$112,000,000 (Christian Work and Evangelist, January 7, 1911).

On these railroads are 100,000 engines drawing two *billion* tons of freight—equals the tonnage of all the rest of the world's railroads and ships combined. This monstrous task is done by 5,500,000 men, paid annually \$2,300,000,000. This vast business is done with \$150,000,000,000 bank clearings.

"Twenty years ago we were second to Great Britain in the output of iron and steel. To-day [1910] our output of iron and steel equals that of all the rest of the world."

We have now [1910] in savings banks, \$3,500,000,000; in national banks, \$4,500,000,000; in state banks, \$5,000,000,000. Grand total, \$13,000,000,000.

The National Bank capital is held by 375,000 persons, of whom 125,000 are women. And women own about half of the immense Pennsylvania Railroad System.

On January 28, 1911, the government reported the annual exports \$1,864,491,944, and the imports, \$1,562,924,251. Total exports and imports, \$3,427,415,895.

The United States wealth in 1910 was \$120,000,000,000.

For the year ending September 30, 1909, the New York clearing house reported \$102,500,000,000; for the first week in January, 1911, \$2,085,627,245.57.

Some people apprehend danger from this tremendous accumulation of wealth on part of corporations and the government. But the danger lies in the *use* made of the money, by government, corporation, or individual.

Instance a *right use*: J. P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller averted the impending financial crash in 1907 by pledging \$110,000,000. And Andrew Carnegie has given \$10,000,000 as a foundation to bring about universal peace among all nations. His other distributions to education, charity, etc., are said to aggregate about \$180,000,000. And the benefactions of John D. Rockefeller amount to about \$175,000,000; Mrs. Leland Stanford, \$30,400,000. Many others—J. S. Rogers, \$5,000,000; Christopher Magee, \$4,000,000; Lewis Elkins, \$2,000,000; Josephine L. Newcomb, \$1,500,000. Others, over a million, J. P. Morgan, P. D. Armour, Mrs. E. Blaine, Mrs. Russell Sage, Miss Helen Gould, *et al.* And thousands of others giving hundreds of thousands and less, show rapid increase in the right use of money.

#### THE CONTENT OF CHRIST IN GOVERNMENT.

(1) What is the content of this expression, Christ in government? What does it mean? What are the essential elements? What constitutes Christ in government?

There is great need of clear thought on this point. Does the expression mean present government as now influenced by current Christianity? Does it mean legislation shaped by the moral teachings of Christ? Or, still more fully, is it the putting into practice in politi-

cal life the moral principles which Christ taught? This is about what is generally understood by the expression, Christ in government, or politics.

But in this way the term Christ is taken to mean principles, moral sentiment. But Christ is not principle nor sentiment. He is a *Divine Person*. The word has its literal meaning.

(2) In order to get a clear view of this matter, one of two ways may be employed, (1) to study the Old Testament prophecies concerning Christ and His kingdom; (2) to examine the New Testament Scriptures clearly portraying Christ and narrating what He said and did.

In employing the first method, one is liable to mistake through a wrong interpretation of the prophecies foretelling Christ and His kingdom. In this way the Jews erred and, in consequence, rejected Christ as being the foretold Messiah.

Christ did not establish a visible, political kingdom, and sit upon the literal, material throne of David, as they interpreted these prophecies; and, consequently, they rejected Him as an impostor.

The second, and safer method, is employed here.

(3) Christ and His apostles use the expression, "kingdom of God," "kingdom of heaven," without any foreword of introduction or explanation. It was a familiar idea in the Jewish mind. Ever since the time of the great statesman and prophet, Daniel, they had been looking forward for the God of heaven to establish a powerful kingdom in Jerusalem with His Son, the Messiah, on the throne of David.

"And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever" (Dan.



2:44). This destruction of these world-kingdoms was indicated by the "Stone cut out of the mountain without hands [which smote the image upon his feet—ver. 34], and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold" (Dan. 2:45).

(4) The universal sovereignty and Divine inauguration of the coming Messiah-King appeared clear: "The Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve Him; His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (Dan. 7:13, 14).

In fact, this kingdom was quite clearly indicated 200 years prior to this, by Isaiah: "Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and thou shalt call His name Immanuel" (Isa. 7:14). "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder: And His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this" (Isa. 9:6, 7).

(5) Christ appropriates to Himself the prophecy in Dan. 7:13: "The Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven," when He foretells the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish state: "Then shalt they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory" (Luke 21:20-27).

"When the Son of Man came to the Ancient of days  
 . . . there was given him dominion, and glory,

and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him" (Dan. 7:13, 14). So, Christ declares: "*All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth*"; going, therefore, disciple ye all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28:19). The emphasis is on "disciple ye."

(6) Christ claims beyond question to be the Messiah-King foretold by Isaiah and Daniel (Luke 4:17-21; (Luke 21:20-17;)) (a) In his royal entrance into Jerusalem, "Hosanna to the Son of David," etc. (Matt. 21:5-9); "Hosanna! Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord (John 12:13); (b) when Pilate put Him the question, "Art thou a king, then?" Jesus answered . . . "I am a King; and to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world; that I should bear testimony to the truth" (John 18:37); (c) in making it His death-testimony by accepting the superscription on His cross, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews" (John 19:19).

(7) The Apostles characterize Him as follows: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (John 1:1).

"God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2:9-11).

"Who is the image of the invisible God the first-born of every creature: For by Him were all things created, that are in the heavens [Gr.], and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him and for Him: And He is before

all things, and by Him all things consist" (Col. 1:15-17).

"God hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds; who, being the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty, on high . . . Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore, God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows," etc. (Heb. 1:2, 3, 8, 9).

This foretold aggressive King is "The Mighty God" creating and carrying forward (Heb. 1:3) all things composing the universe, and is seated on the throne of David, ruling the world in righteousness. The German author, Jean Paul Richter, well expresses it: "Christ, who being the mightiest among the holy, and the holiest among the mighty, lifted with His pierced hands empires off their hinges, turned the stream of centuries out of its channel, and still governs the ages."

(8) When Christ received His dominion from His Father, "the Ancient of days," it was enacted in the spiritual, unseen domain; and the transaction was known to mankind through Daniel's vision alone (Dan. 7:13, 14).

Likewise the establishing of His dominion, or kingdom, in mankind is enacted in the spiritual, unseen domain.

But the Jews were looking for it in the open, in a spectacular manner. Jesus rebuked their materialism as He said: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation [watching closely, observing constantly—Gr.]; neither shall they say, Lo here, or lo there! for

the kingdom of God is within you" (Luke 17:20, 21)—*Within* believers; *entos* means *within* only, never among; eleven other Greek words mean among, but not within.

The coming of Christ in His kingdom cannot be seen by "watching closely," He says; for visible things do not constitute it. He declares: "My kingdom is not of this world . . . not from hence" (John 18:36), not constituted of this world nor produced by it. On the contrary, He said: "I am from above" (John 8:23); and He commanded His disciples before His resurrection and Pentecost to pray. "Thy kingdom come; thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10). Christ and His kingdom cannot be communicated of man, "He cannot know them" (1 Cor. 2:12-14). Only by revelation can we know them: "It pleased God . . . to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the heathen" (Gal. 1:15, 16).

"The kingdom of God is not in word [doctrine] but in power"—dynamite (1 Cor. 4:20). It is in "power"—not *exousia*—authority, organizing ability, but *dynamis*—dynamite, force, "the force of God" (Rom. 1:16. "The kingdom of God is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 14:17), not righteousness, peace, and joy of religion in the abstract and impersonal, but righteousness in the Holy Spirit, peace in the Holy Spirit, and joy in the Holy Spirit. They are not imparted, but known only in union with the Divine Personality. One may have religious peace and religious joy and right opinions, and yet not have the kingdom of God within. We do not enter the kingdom of God by preparatory correction and instruction in opinions, but by preparatory spiritual birth and by faith: "Except a man be born again [from above] he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Except a man be

born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:3, 5).

Nicodemus did not have this consciousness of spiritual birth from "above," and Christ rebuked him: "Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" (John 3:10). According to Christ's teaching here, becoming a child of God by spiritual birth, is not entrance into the kingdom of God, but is preparatory thereto. Accordingly John the Baptist was called "to go before the face of the Lord to *prepare* his ways, to give the *knowledge of salvation* unto his people by the *remission of their sins*" (Luke 1:77).

The initial child of God is one thing; but, to be in the kingdom of God, is another. The first was John the Baptist; so were his true disciples and all the Old Testament saints (Heb. 11:4-39); but they were not in the kingdom of God, for as yet it was not established; hence Christ says: "The Law and the Prophets were until John: *since that time* the kingdom of God is preached" (Luke 16:16).

That the kingdom of God was then being established is beyond doubt; for (a) Christ "sent them to preach the kingdom of God," and "they went through the towns, preaching the gospel; therefore the kingdom of God in the gospel"; (b) for Christ plainly affirmed it: "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom" (Matt. 16:28); so Luke 9:27; "Verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power" (Mark 9:1). That this occurred in Pentecost, is evident.

But these Scriptures imply the *personal* manifestation of Christ? *Doubtless*. Now, since current Christianity has no such manifestations of Christ, it is in-

ferred that the *personal* manifestations of Christ have ceased by Divine order. The fallacy in this reasoning is the baseless assumption that current Christianity is that of the New Testament.

Current Christianity is so far below the standard of the New Testament, that it shapes all religious opinions, and prejudices the mind against the Christianity revealed in the New Testament. By darkening the mind and searing the conscience, current Christianity, in large measure, bars out of the world the Christianity of the New Testament.

Manifesting the *Divine Personality* in the Christian consciousness is the fundamental (Matt. 28:19) and chief excellence of the gospel (2 Cor. 3:14-18). It is an essential, integral part of the gospel, as these texts plainly show: "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; but ye know Him, for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you . . . He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, *and manifest myself unto him* . . . And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and *make our abode with him*" (John 14:15-23) . . . "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you. And when he is come [unto you], He will reprove [convict] the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. Of sin because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father . . . of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged



. . . When the Spirit of truth is come [unto you] He will guide you into all the truth; for He shall not speak of Himself [from His own authority]; but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak; and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for He shall receive of mine and show it unto you. All things that the Father hath, are mine: therefore said I, that 'He shall take of mine and shall show it unto you'" (John 16:7-15).

"They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world . . . I pray for them also which shall believe on me through thy word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (John 17:16-21). Here is the most intimate relation of *personality*.

And God's ideal kingdom is constituted of His ideal King and of His ideal subjects; hence Paul's prayer, for the Church at Ephesus, to the Father:

"That He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit [accepted years before, Acts 19:2-6] in the inner man: (a) *That Christ may dwell in your hearts* by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled unto all the fulness of God" (Eph. 3:16-19).

In like manner Paul prayed for the Church at Colosse: "That ye might be filled with the knowledge of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding; that ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing

---

(a) "That Christ may take up His abode" (A. W. Mayer); "lasting abode" (Alford) in your hearts.

in the full knowledge [Gr.] of God; strengthened with all might, according to His glorious power, unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness" (Col. 1:9-11).

In both of these prayers, the grace implored is according to God's glorious power; and its glory is its Almightyness.

John Fletcher, on John 14:23, says that "This spiritual abode of Christ in the souls of His people is the most glorious mystery of the Gospel" (Works, Vol. III., p. 196). It is "the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to His saints. To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles which is *Christ in you*, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:26, 27).

It is this *personal* indwelling of Christ and God, and not the grace of Perfect Love, that differentiates the Gospel, the kingdom of God, from the dispensation of Moses. Christ declares Perfect Love to be the characterizing grace of the "Law and Prophets" (Matt. 22:36, 40). And Moses so declared (Lev. 19:2, 18, 34).

The erroneous notion that the Mosaic dispensation is one of mere symbols, religious ceremonies; and that actual salvation from sin was brought in by the Gospel, mistakes the Old Testament and makes impossible the New Testament Kingdom of God, with Christ manifest in the heart (Eph. 3:17).

The eminent exegete and associate of John Wesley, John Fletcher, Vicar of Madeley, says: "This manifestation is, sooner or later, in a higher or lower degree, vouchsafed to every sincere seeker, through the medium of one or more of the spiritual senses opened in his soul, in a gradual or instantaneous manner, as it pleases God" (Fletcher's Works, Vol. IV., p. 282). Mr. Fletcher cites God speaking with Moses (Deut.

5:24): "face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend" (Exod. 33:11); appearing to Joshua near Jericho (Josh. 5:13); to Samuel (1 Sam. 3:7; 9:17); to Solomon (1 Kings 9:2); Micaiah (1 Kings 22:19); to Elisha (2 Kings 6:17); to Isaiah (Isa. 6:1); to Ezekiel times so numerous, I refer you to the book itself, and then observes: "If, because we have the letter of Scripture, we must be deprived of all immediate manifestations of Christ and His Spirit, we are great losers by that blessed book, and we might reasonably say, "Lord, bring us back to the dispensation of Moses . . . O Lord, if because we have this blessed picture of thee, we must have no discovery of the glorious original, have compassion on us, take back thy precious book, and impart thy more precious self to us as thou didst to thy ancient people." And then he declares: "That particular manifestations of Christ, far from ceasing with the Jewish, have increased in brightness and spirituality under the Christian dispensation" (Works, Vol. IV., pp. 300, 301).

Mr. Fletcher then cites Pentecost: "They received the gift of the Holy Ghost, whose office it is to manifest the Son . . . He then came revealed in the power of the Spirit" (Fletcher's Works, Vol. IV., p. 305). So the greatest of German exegetes, August Wilhelm Meyer, declares of Pentecost: "In the mission of the Spirit the self-communication of the exalted Christ takes place" (On John 14:16, 17). Likewise the eminent F. Godet, of deep spiritual insight: "He associated them in His state as raised from the dead, just as later through Pentecost He will make them participate in His state as glorified" (Com. on John 20:22).

Mr. Fletcher continues to show frequent personal manifestations of Christ in the Christian dispensation, and cites Stephen before the Jewish Council in Jeru-

salem: "And when they heard these things [Stephen's defense], they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth. But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked steadfastly up into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said 'Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God'" (Acts 7:54-56).

He then gives Paul's experience at Corinth, where Christ said to Him: "Be not afraid . . . for I am with thee," etc., and his account of being in the third heaven. Paul had so many manifestations of the spiritual and eternal that he calls them "visions and revelations of the Lord" (2 Cor. 12:1), so many were there, that he did not give the number, but said "the *abundance* of revelations" (verse 7).

And the manifestations of Christ to the Apostle John were so many that an entire book is given to them (Rev. 1:1). These manifestations indicate spiritual transformation of the subject. In fact, this is Paul's idea of Christianity—constant transformation of character as we behold the glorified Christ and so "changed from glory to glory" (2 Cor. 3:18). John conditions his visions on being "in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Rev. 1:10). So Stephen was much spiritualized prior to his wonderful vision: "All that sat in the council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel" (Acts 16:15).

The transforming power of these manifestations of Christ in the Christian believer is wonderful, affecting his entire physical being. The basis of this is the scientific fact stated by Dr. Franz Delitzsch, that "The soul is the image of the spirit and makes the body the image of itself" (Biblic. Psychol., p. 272). In proof is the face of Moses (Exod. 34:29, 30); of Stephen (Acts 6:15); of Christ (Luke 9:28-29). The trans-

figuration (Mark 9:2, 3) proves the extreme susceptibility of opaque matter to become glorified. Well! Nature continually abounds in evidences; the rose in composition and color is one illustration of many. If vegetable life can so glorify crass matter, what may not God's life do in man?

The human body is no punishment and trammel to the soul and spirit, as paganism teaches (Brahmans and Plato), but a fit instrument to express the soul and spirit. It is an incontestible fact in science expressed by Dr. Franz Delitzsch that: "Matter with its powers is incapable of carrying its action over into the region of the spirit . . . Briefly, matter has no power over the spirit, except so far as the spirit itself makes it to have; for it is the power over matter" (Biblical Psychology, p. 261). Likewise Dr. A. W. Meyer says: "There is nothing in the Biblical use of the term to justify the opinion that the flesh [*sarks*, literal body] is itself evil or necessarily productive of sin. So, Dr. Adolf Wuttke: "The natural body, the sensuous corporeality, is despite its seemingly trammeling power over the freedom of the spirit, *per se* absolutely good; and there is neither anything evil in it nor is it the cause of any evil whatsoever" (Christian Ethics, Vol. II., p. 59).

As the instrument of the spirit and soul, the body may suggest sin and Satan, or it may suggest purity and God, accordingly as Satan or God dwells within: "Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God" (Rom. 6:13).

The action of the mind puts its impress in the body—especially the face. If Satan controls that action his

impress will be in the face; on the other hand, if God controls it, the face will reveal His impress.

As citizens in the kingdom of God, at this point focalizes our tremendous responsibility. Our faces make public our private character. President Mark Hopkins well expresses it: "In a community whose moral nature is developed, high moral character is the purest, best, the amplest contribution to mere enjoyment that can be made. It is better than pictures or statues or landscape gardens. Such a contribution every man can make by attending to his own state; and it is among the more imperative obligations of love to do this. That this end of love would be most fully reached by our perfection, is too plain to need enforcement. Everywhere the highest complacency demands perfection . . . We are also under obligation to seek it, because it is a condition of our most fully glorifying God" (Ethics, p. 147).

Accordingly also Dr. Adolf Wuttke properly declares: "The believer was to make his spiritual and physical being a dwelling-place of God. This moral task is two-fold, to perfect himself and to perfect the community in the image of God, so that he and the community will reflect the image of God" (Ethics, Vol. II., p. 27).

Not only the individual and the community—the nation—are to reveal God; but also nature itself, by man's sin dismantled of pristine perfection, and under Divine sentence "Cursed is the ground for thy sake" (Gen. 3:17), is again to bear the impress of God, "For the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now . . . to be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty [into the liberty of the glory, Gr.] of the children of God" (Rom. 8:22, 21).

Redemptive glory excels creative glory.



## CHAPTER IX.

## THE DIVINE PROVISION.

Discouragement results from not knowing God's plan for human life. Men do not see God's provision for establishing His kingdom on the earth. Surrounded by sinners and being sinful themselves, how can men keep from sinning? In fact, most people, even church folks, do not think it possible to live without committing sin. And the idea of the whole government being carried on without sin, is to them simply preposterous—contrary to common sense.

They honestly think this because they do not take much stock in the gospel, believing only so much of it as pertains to forgiveness of sins and final safety in heaven. They doubt both the Divine provision and the human profession of any greater grace in this world.

Their own living is no satisfaction to themselves. They fail to live up to their own moral standard, low as it is; and they make their own failure a sample of the religious life in general. They do not see that God gives no promise of success on the basis of their limited, fragmentary view of the gospel. Their ignorance of the real gospel is a calamity. They do not read the Bible. It is distasteful. They regularly read the "dailies"; and fiction beguiles them into late hours. But to "search the Scriptures" and pray in secret, they find no time. Everything positively religious is displaced by entertaining and being entertained. True of them as God declared of Israel: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge" (Hosea 4:6).

They see nothing more in the gospel than pardon

of sins and deliverance in heaven, and believe that to be Christianity. As for the Divine precepts: "Be not conformed to this world" (Rom. 12:2); "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying that it may minister grace unto the hearers" (Eph. 4:29); "Nor filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting" (Eph. 5:4); "whose adorning, let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair or wearing of gold, etc., but let it be the hidden man of the heart" (1 Peter 3:3, 4; 1 Tim. 2:9)—as for these precepts and others like them, they ignore them; and, if pressed, some despise them.

To rescue man from this moral degradation and wilful ignorance and to afford him safety from harm and to supply all needful helps to his destined progress, God meets man on grounds of mutual knowledge. It is on such grounds only that man can understand God.

These grounds manifest God's sovereignty, man's accountability and the fact of sin. Basal, then, in redemption is the doctrine of sin. As man knows sin, it is two-fold—an *act* of the will and a *state* of the heart.

This distinction is clear in both Calvinian and Arminian theology. Dr. C. Hodge says: "All sin is not an agency, activity, or *act*; it may be, and is also a condition, a *state* of the mind. This distinction has been recognized and admitted in the Church from the beginning" (Systematic Theology, Vol. II., p. 187).

Dr. D. D. Whedon says, "No doubt there is a *state* of evil, as well as an evil *action*, which in the Scriptures is called sin (Comment on Rom. 5:12).

The Scriptures are very clear on this point: "Sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4); "Sins that are past" (Rom. 3:25). This sin is a matter of choice. On the other hand, "Sin that dwelleth in

me" (Rom. 7:17, 20); "Law of sin which is in my members" (Rom. 7:23); "Sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3) denote a sin-principle in man's nature, back of the will.

Accordingly, the provision for the removal of sin from man is also two-fold: Atonement for (1) forgiveness, or remission—"A propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past" (Rom. 3:25). "He is the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 2:2).

(2) "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29); "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, as a sin-offering, condemned sin in the flesh that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. 8:3, 4). "If we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John 1:9).

As here are two distinct forms of sin, so there are two distinct acts of God in its removal—*forgiving* the acts of sin, and *cleansing* the unrighteousness, or pollution, of sin.

"The verbs are *aorist* because the purpose of the faithfulness and justice of God is to do *each* as one great complex act—to justify and to sanctify wholly and entirely" (Alford).

If sinners are obligated to accept Christ atoning for acts of sin; are not the regenerate as fully obligated to accept Christ atoning for states of sin—"sin dwelling in us"? Who can span the fallacy of calling the former Christianity, and the latter "fanaticism"? It is this fallacy that lies at the root of the general back-sliding and indifference among professed believers.

Having initially accepted Christ for pardon of sins, they ignore the Divine command: "As ye have there-

fore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him" (Col. 2:6).

Instead of advancing in religious experience by an advancing faith—"from faith to faith" (Rom. 1:17), they bank on their initial faith for pardon of sins, in order to advance in Christian experience, whereas "we walk by faith" (2 Cor. 5:7); and *to walk* is to advance by definite, successive steps.

Another class of persons go one step further than the former class. These believe in a definite second step securing purity of heart from "indwelling sin" (Rom. 7:17, 20). And they bank on this act of faith for further advancement in grace. They believe in a "second" definite step but "not a third." Both these classes advocate advancement in Christian experience, but not by definite steps. But to walk requires definite steps, for there is no other way to advance except to *slide*. The Bible-order is to walk—not to slide. And a child knows that *two* steps do not constitute to walk. Hence the fallacy of claiming that the Christian life has but two definite steps—pardon of sins and cleansing of heart. God's command is: "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him" (Col. 2:6). And to walk is to advance by definite, successive steps.

Both these classes effectually bar the way to further progress. Against them John Wesley declares this warning: "Does not the talking, without proper caution, of a justified or sanctified state, tend to mislead men? Almost naturally leading them to trust in what was done in a moment?" (Works, Vol. V., 239).

Likewise Mr. Wesley's associate, Rev. John Fletcher, declares: "Mr. Wesley has many persons in his societies who profess they were justified or sanctified in a moment; but instead of trusting in the living God, so trust in what was done in a moment as to give

over taking up their cross and watching unto prayer with all perseverance. The consequences are deplorable: they slide back into the spirit of the world; and their tempers are no longer regulated by the meek, gentle, humble love of Jesus" (Tyerman's *Life of Fletcher's*, p. 200).

Fundamental in all this is the error that the main thing in Christianity is the sin-question; that getting rid of sin is the chief aim of the gospel. This is the destructive side of the atonement; the constructive side is the greater, hence the covenant of baptism aims directly at fellowship in the Trinity, not even naming sin (Matt. 28:19), already removed under Moses, as circumcision indicates (Rom. 4:11); "Circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter" (Rom. 2:29); "in putting off the body of sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ" (Col. 2:11). And so Orthodox Theology teaches: "Circumcision held out the promise of justification by faith alone to every truly penitent offender. It went further, and was a sign of sanctification, or the taking away of that pollution of sin . . . as well as the pardon of actual offenses" (Watson's *Institutes*, Vol. II., p. 626).

Dr. D. D. Whedon: "Circumcision is a symbol of purification" (Comment on Rom. 2:29). So Adam Clarke on same.

#### ATONEMENT BEYOND THE SIN QUESTION.

Bishop Phillips Brooks has admonitively declared: "The idea of rescue has monopolized our religion." That is, making Christianity consist in rescuing men from sin and its punishment; whereas, that simply prepares men to enter Christianity, or the kingdom of God, as we have seen, and shall now see more fully.

1. There is atonement specially for the gift of the Holy Spirit: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law . . . That the blessing of Abraham

might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith" (Gal. 3:13, 14), that is, the promised Spirit [Joel 2:28, 29; Luke 24:49] (Brown and Faussett). And so Luther's translation, *den verheizenen Geist*—the promised Spirit.

This *personal* coming of the foretold Spirit began a new era. It inaugurated a new dispensation. The former dispensations were administered *unto* mankind; this, *within* man. Dean Alford rightly says: "The gift of the Spirit at and since the day of Pentecost, was and is, something totally distinct from anything before that time, a new and loftier dispensation."

2. In the increased light of the Spirit, one now sees atonement specially for the Church: "Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself up for it; that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. 5:25-27) [R. V.] A spotless, glorious Christ requires His bride—the Church—to be spotless and glorious, in order to their perfect union, "one with Him as He is one with the Father, *that the world may believe*" (John 17:21). The "sanctify" in this Scripture does not mean to cleanse, for that is declared already done, "having cleansed it." The result of "sanctify" is not cleansed, but "glorious," "a glorious Church."

3. Atonement specially for entrance into the glory beyond the second veil, is now seen: "Now where remission of these [sins and iniquities] is, there remaineth no more [no longer, Gr.] offering for sin" (Heb. 10:18). Is there, then, vicarious offering for anything else? Surely. The next verse gives it. "Hav-



ing therefore, brethren, boldness [freedom] to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus . . . through the veil, that is to say, His flesh . . . Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering" (Heb. 10:18-23).

Here, foregoing fitness to enter the "holiest" is inward purity of heart and outward purity of life. Such a purified person may, "by the blood of Jesus," further applied, enter "through the veil" to behold the Lord in glory. And this is made the excellency of the gospel over the dispensation of Moses: "But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away . . . And we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit," R. V. (2 Cor. 3:15-18).

On this text John Fletcher says: "Mr. Wesley clearly distinguishes Christian faith properly so-called, or faith in Christ glorified, not only from the faith of a heathen, but also from the faith of initial Christianity" (Fletcher's Works, Vol. I., p. 589). By "faith of initial Christianity" Mr. Wesley means "the faith which the Apostles had while our Lord was upon earth." And by that faith they became children of God with their "names written in heaven" (Luke 10:20); "cleansed" from sin (John 15:3); "Not of the world," even as Christ (John 17:14, 16); And were enabled to "heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils" (Matt. 10:8).

It is very evident that the faith of present Christianity falls far short of "the faith of *initial* Christ-

ianity" both in purity and power. The characterization of current Christianity by the General Conference Episcopal Address [1896] is sadly true: "When we look at God's ideal, promise, provision, and power, at the humiliation and exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ, at the unwordable groanings of the Holy Spirit, it seems as if *provision and performance were scarcely at all related* (Discipline).

4. But notwithstanding human failure, God's truth abides, and is destined to prevail in glorifying real Christians (2 Thess. 2:14; 1:12; John 17:17).

This Christianity-characterizing text under consideration (2 Cor. 3:18) is wonderful. The term "changed"—in R. V. "transformed"—is the same word used to express the glorified condition of Christ and His vesture in the transfiguration (Matt. 17:1, 2; Luke 9:28, 29). "His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light," "became shining, exceeding white as snow" (Mark 9:3), "glistening" (Luke 9:29).

What Christ experienced here "as He prayed" (Luke 9:29) indicates what is meant in 2 Cor. 3:18. The idea in this text is given by Dr. D. D. Whedon: "The more we gaze in sympathy upon Him the more we cognize Him and become like Him, which again increases our perceptive power, and thus there is a constant interaction and progress" (Commentary).

5. In this connection Paul speaks of the "illumination of the gospel of the glory of Christ," R. V. (2 Cor. 4:4), and testifies to its experience "unto [to the degree of] the illumination of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 4:6). [Did he refer to the transfiguration? or the glorified Christ? Acts 26:13] More likely to that in 2 Cor. 3:18, the standard Christianity.

In the same connection Paul confesses that there "is

*working* to us [in us—Vulgate] an eternal weight of glory according to hyperbole unto hyperbole," "*kath hyperboleen eis hyperboleen*, if anybody knows what that is" (Whedon). The "scholar of a thousand years" (Theodore Parker) and great commentator, Dr. Adam Clarke, says that the expression is "infinitely emphatical, and cannot be fully expressed by any translation . . . It signifies that all hyperboles fall short of describing that weight so solid and lasting that you may pass from hyperbole to hyperbole, and yet, when you had gained the last, you are infinitely below it" (Adam Clarke).

It corresponds with what Paul elsewhere calls "the unsearchable riches of Christ" (Eph. 3:8).

6. This glory is not limited to a favored few, but is for each believing Christian: "And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them ["which shall believe on me"]; that they may be one, even as we are one" (John 17:17).

Everyone obligated to accept salvation is also obligated to accept this glory: "God hath from the beginning chosen you unto salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth; whereunto He called you by our gospel, *to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ*" (2 Thess. 2:13, 14).

This Scripture proves that this glory of Christ for believers is not added to the gospel for future enjoyment, neither is it an exceptional result produced by it; but it is an integral and essential part of the gospel itself. So Paul, respecting the rank of Christians, exorts, "That ye would walk worthy of God, who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory" (1 Thess. 2:12).

The eminent Dr. August Wilhelm Meyer comments on this text: "God calls the reader to participate in His kingdom (*i. e.*, Messianic) and in His glory."

John Wesley's chosen expositor of theology, Rev. John Fletcher, wisely declares: "With respect to the glory of the Lord, it is at hand. Whatever false wisdom and unbelief may whisper to our hearts, it can not be farther off than the presence of Him who fills all in all. Our wrong notions of things are a main hindrance to our stepping into it. 'There is a passing,' says Bromley, 'from the outward to the inward, and from the inward to the inmost'; and it is only from the inmost that we can see the Lord's glory" (Pastoral Letters, p. 323).

7. This glory being an essential part of the gospel, it continues with the continuance of the gospel. John Fletcher "insisted that the latter-day glory . . . should far exceed the first effusion of the Spirit," and testifies, "I was favored, like Moses, with a supernatural discovery of the glory of God, in an ineffable converse with him, face to face; so that whether I was then in the body or out of the body, I can not tell" (Tyerman's Life of Fletcher, p. 391).

So the great Presbyterian polemic and pietist, President Jonathan Edwards: "Pentecost . . . was only as it were, a feast of the first-fruits; the ingathering is at the end of the year . . . and will probably as much exceed what was in the first ages of the Christian Church . . . as that exceeded all that had been before" (Edwards on Revivals, p. 198).

President Charles G. Finney testifies: "All at once a light perfectly ineffable shone in my soul, that almost prostrated me to the ground. . . . This light seemed to be like the brightness of the sun in every direction. It was too intense for the eyes. I recollect casting my eyes down and breaking into a flood of tears, in view of the fact that mankind did not praise God. I think I knew something then, by actual experience, of that light that prostrated Paul on his way

to Damascus. It was surely a light such as I could not have endured long" (Autobiography, pp. 19, 34).

Contemporary with John Wesley was Rev. William Bramwell, who testifies: "To be cleansed from sin is great indeed, but to receive the inward glory in its full influence,—this is the salvation. The Lord waits to impart everything He has promised; and would, as a kind father, rather, much rather, that His children had the whole" (Life of Bramwell, p. 210).

8. God has not only provided and promised this glory, but also Himself brings it about: "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, *make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in His sight through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever and ever, Amen*" (Heb. 13:20, 21).

"Work out your own salvation [to completion] with fear and trembling; for it is *God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure*" (Phil. 2:12, 13). "Strengthened with all might according to his glorious power [with all dynamite dynamized *according to the dominion of his glory*, Gk] unto all patience and long suffering with joyfulness" (Col. 1:11).

Thus God establishes His kingdom by ruling the individual; for the government is the individual repeated. "Thy people also shall be all righteous . . . I the Lord will hasten it in his time" (Isa. 60:21, 22). Each nation is fully saved by each citizen being "saved unto the uttermost" as to every destructive want and as to every constructive need (Heb. 7:25). The distinguished Lutheran Biblicist, Dr. Franz Delitzsch, on this text, says: "Christ is able to save perfectly and to the very end, but without necessarily any reference to time. He is able to save in every way, in all re-

spects, and unto the uttermost, so that every want and need in all its breadth and depth is utterly done away. This salvation is vouchsafed to those who through Him approach to God."

And the "Prince of Commentators" (Spurgeon), Dr. Adam Clarke, on this text, says: "He is able to save, from the power, guilt, nature and punishment of sin, to the uttermost, *eis to panteles* to all intents, degrees, and purposes, and always and through all times, places, and circumstances; for all this is implied in the original word."

Such a salvation actualizes our Lord's prayer given His disciples before Pentecost: "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done in earth as it is done in heaven" (Matt. 6:10); likewise His own prayer, "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (John 17:21).

With such a complete change in the nature and relations of man, and with God to accomplish it, municipal, state, national, and international government in God is the most reasonable thing conceivable.

The United States, as well as other nations, and excelling other nations, universally allowed, with human nature simply *improved* by civilization, and *aided* by a very slight acceptance of gospel provision, is making great advance toward God's order. Then, with *full* acceptance of the gospel and *complete* submission to God's will for the individual, the community, the state, the nation, and the world, what good and great thing could not be accomplished?

Our situation is well expressed by Ex-President Theodore Roosevelt in his Thanksgiving Proclamation of November 1, 1904: ". . . In this great Republic the effort to combine national strength with personal freedom is being tried on a scale more gigantic than



ever before in the world's history. Our success will mean much, not only for ourselves, but for the future of all mankind; and every man or woman in our land should feel the grave responsibility resting upon him or her; for in the last analysis this success must depend upon the high average of our individual citizenship, upon the way in which each of us does his duty by himself and his neighbors."

Under God's order and rule the individual is saved "unto the uttermost" (Heb. 7:25), as just shown, "bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (2 Cor. 10:5); regulating every sensibility by the "knowledge-surpassing love of Christ" (Eph. 3:19), "having over all love, the uniting-bond of perfectness" (Col. 3:14)—"binding together all the other graces into a perfect whole" (Whedon); "and the body freed from disease" (Deut. 7:15; Ex. 15:26; Matt. 4:23; 9:35; 10:1, 8) is exalted into a "temple of the Holy Ghost" (1 Cor. 6:19), and the community is elevated into "an habitation of God through the Spirit" (Eph. 2:22). To believe this under the gospel powers and marvelous administration of the Holy Spirit inaugurated at Pentecost should be no straining effort; since the Hebrew nation of two and a half millions, emerging from Egyptian slavery, *fifteen hundred years before Pentecost*, were so perfect in body and mind that "there was not a feeble person among their tribes" (Psa. 105:37).

In this divine kingdom of recreated humanity infinite variety blends in heavenly harmony. Infancy has a new meaning; childhood, youth, manhood and womanhood, marriage, parenthood, riper years, and age rise into new relations, divine ideals, and holy purposes. Religion, life, hygiene, education, science, art, literature, philosophy, jurisprudence, law, politics, legislation, and government—all reveal the guiding

hand of God. Agriculture, labor and capital, manufacture, commerce, and every other industry—all are exalted to noble rank and sealed to holy service. The strong and the weak, the rich and the poor, the great and the small, of all races and nations make the holy brotherhood of Christ for the Christian welfare of all; and all the world is kin.

### GOVERNMENT A SACRED TRUST.

Most people regard nations as the work of conquerors and of statesmen. But these are simply instrumental in the hands of God, who "hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord," etc. (Acts 17:26).

Government is a sacred trust from God. This is the human side. The foregoing Scriptures on the "kingdom of God" presented the Divine side with its provisions and administration. On the human side are presented the conditions to be supplied.

Faith is the fundamental condition. "The Lord said unto Abram . . . In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. 12:3). "In thy seed shall *all the nations of the earth* be blessed; *because thou hast obeyed my voice*" (Gen. 22:18).

"Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. . . . For the promise, that he should be the *heir of the world*, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but *through the righteousness of faith*" (Rom. 4:3, 13).

All the world is benefited by the faith of Abraham. "All the families of the earth"—"all the nations of the earth"—are blest "because Abraham obeyed God." To what measure the faith of Abraham accounts for

the present welfare of the Christian and the non-Christian nations of to-day is a question of tremendous import.

And, to his faith, that of all Christians is added by divine order: "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour" (1 Tim. 2:1-3). Note that this prayer of faith for the national welfare is "*first of all*." It supersedes other Christian duties to men. Political rulers, "*the powers that be*, are ordered of God," are the "ministers of God" (Rom. 13:1, 4) in His Government of the world; therefore God would belt the world with supplication, prayer, and intercession for its purification and elevation into heavenly peace and power.

John Wesley saw the sacred trust of government and felt the force of Christ's commission to gospelize the nations. Accordingly the "*Large Minutes*" of his first conference states the design of Methodism as follows: "Messengers sent by the Lord, out of the common way, to provoke the regular clergy to jealousy, and to supply the lack of service toward those who are perishing for want of knowledge, and, *above all*, to reform the nation by spreading Scriptural holiness over the land" (Pierce—Ecclesiastical Prin. and Polity of Wesleyan Meth., p. 255).

This was *a hundred and fifty* years ago. Mr. Wesley's followers, both in England and in America, for the most part, have in large measure lost sight of both the first design and the characterizing experience of early Methodism. In consequence, current Christianity is belated more than a century.

But God is never straitened for resources. The

conditioning faith will be supplied by somebody. "All things are possible to him that believeth" (Mark 9:23). and "According to your faith be it unto you" (Matt. 9:29), stand good for all time both for individuals and for nations.

All the fulness of God is in Christ (Col. 2:9), and Christ is at once the Center and Support of the world's advance: "He is before all things and by him all things consist" (Col. 1:17). "He is the cement as well as support of the universe" (Wesley). And all the fulness of Christ is revealed in the gospel (Gal. 1:8, 9), which, like the meridian sun, is self-luminous and self-protecting, with boundless light and power to give away. See Paul's *three* reasons why he is not ashamed of the gospel: (1) "Because it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth—to the Jew first, and also to the Greek"; (2) "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, 'The just shall live by faith';" (3) "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold" [hinder R. V., hold back (Whedon), keep down (Meyer)] "the truth in unrighteousness" (Rom. 1:16-18).

This applies to the nation as well as to the individual: "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted" (Isa. 60:12).

In estimating sin, God differs widely from men. Men allow gross or criminal actions to be sin, but neglecting the Divine remedy for its removal is not regarded as a thing of much significance; whereas God makes this the chief—the damning sin—of moral agents.

In this unbelief this absence of faith, to "hold back," to "keep down" the truth, is the basal element.

This is done by both Jew and Gentile. But "there is no respect of persons with God; for as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law, and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law" (Rom. 2:11, 12). Even if those who are without God's written law, but "from the creation of the world have clearly seen His eternal power and Godhead," it is declared "that they are without excuse, because that when they knew God they glorified him not as God" (Rom. 1:20, 21).

The "gospel of the glory of the blessed God" (1 Tim. 1:11), with its endless bliss for believers, carries with it endless wrath for unbelievers (Rom. 1:18). "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him" (John 3:36).

This brings the question of future punishment for consideration in the next chapter, without which this treatise would not be complete.

## CHAPTER X.

## FUTURE ENDLESS PUNISHMENT.

This is a vital question. It merits the most careful consideration. A right view of the nature and of the design of punishment is most important.

1. "Punishment is any pain, suffering, or loss, inflicted on a person because of a crime or offense" (Webster).

Human nature instinctively shrinks from pain. This tends to bias the judgment in the study of this question. In human government the adjustment of penalty to the violation of law is a most important problem of jurisprudence. Two things must be considered: (1) the public good; (2) the personal rights of the transgressor.

Instance: Brewers and saloon keepers object to summary legislation because the penalties attached to prohibition laws violate, they claim, the personal liberty of the American citizen.

"The seventh Beer Brewers' Congress, held in Chicago, June 5, 1867, declared:

"Whereas, The acts and influence of the temperance party is in direct opposition to the principles of individual and political equality upon which our American Union is founded; therefore,

"Resolved, That we will use all means to stay the progress of this fanatical party, and to *secure our individual rights* as citizens, and that we will sustain no candidate of whatever party, in any election, who is in any way disposed toward the total abstinence cause."

"This was more than two years before the Prohibition Party was organized" (G. T. Stewart).



The death of 110,000 drunkards annually, over *three-fourths* of all the crimes committed, the taking from the people over *one billion dollars*, giving in turn drunkenness, disgrace, poverty and destruction of families and outraged widowhood and homeless orphans by the hundred thousand, and annually destroying 80,000 (?) young women in the haunts of ill-fame housing over 400,000 "fallen" women patronized by 2,000,000 "fallen" men, *usually connected with the saloon* (Wholesale and Retailers' Review)—all this destruction of the public good the "Brewers' Congress" did not consider. They magnified individual liberty to the exclusion of the public welfare. Thus completely self-centered and rejecting counter rights of everybody else "of whatever party," they claim the "individual right" to conduct the saloon business notwithstanding its harm to the public welfare. In political phrase, it is State rights superior to the Federal Government. But to make national government possible every State and individual right contrary to the public good must be surrendered.

Putting the individual interest above the public good, practiced by the brewers and saloon keepers, has been condemned by The United States Supreme Court repeatedly.

On March 6, 1847, Chief Justice Taney, with the unanimous concurrence of his associate Judges, declared: "If any State deems the retail and internal traffic in ardent spirits injurious to its citizens, and calculated to produce idleness, vice, and debauchery, I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States to prevent it from regulating and restraining the traffic, or from prohibiting it altogether, if it thinks proper." This was under a Democratic administration.

And thirty years later, December 5, 1887, under a Republican administration, an equally unanimous de-

cision was handed down. The text is: "It is within the discretionary powers of the State to protect public health, safety, and morals, even by the destruction of property; and the Kansas laws providing for the destruction of property used in connection with liquor-selling do not violate the provision of the 14th amendment to the Constitution against the destruction of property."

Still later: "No legislature can bargain away the public health or public morals. The people themselves can not do it, much less their servants."

2. Notwithstanding that universal jurisprudence condemns the fatal principle of preferring individual interests to the public good, effort is being made to do this very thing by ignoring not only the authority of laws which protect the public welfare, but rejecting the fact of government itself; that, too, under guise of the highest sanctity, or immanence of God, "humane, tender, fatherly, approachable without intermediaries."

This rejects the "One Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 2:5), (Heb. 9:15; 12:24), who declares, "I am the way, the truth, and the life; *no man cometh unto the Father but by me*" (John 14:6).

Note: "No man cometh *unto the Father* but by me." As "tender *Father*" He is no more approachable than an absolute King, but by the blood of Christ (Rom. 3:25) "to declare His righteousness" as absolute Sovereign that "He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. 3:26). Albeit the scholarly misled doubter says, "God must not be conceived as . . . a king"; when the fact is that He is not Father to sinners, except through their faith in Christ as Mediator they become children of God, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:26). And "Whosoever is born of God doth not

commit sin." . . . "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil" (1 John 3:9, 10). Committing sin constitutes one a child of the devil. This is God's word: "He that committeth sin is of the devil" (1 Jno. 3:8; and "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law" (1 Jno. 3:4).

3. Law implies government; and government implies punishment for violation of law, inflicted by a just governor. Now, to get rid of Divine punishment it is proposed to reject both government and Governor: "We are fast displacing the entire conception of God as a governor by the conception of God as a father. And the conception of the divine government is giving place to the conception of the divine family."

With this naturally departs the sense of sin; for the author of the foregoing continues: "And sin itself, as we find it among men, is largely the wilfulness of freedom which has not learned self-control, rather than any deliberate choice of evil."

A third misled leader of thought says: "Nobody has been assured by competent authority that the Decalogue in its entirety is a moral code." . . . "The fourth commandment is indeed gone as a statute." A fourth doubter derisively says: "It is unscientific and absurd to imagine that God ever turned stone-mason, and chiseled commandments on a rock." A fifth misled misleader of the people says: "You must do this, you must do that; precepts that take this shape are not morality; they are law." . . . "The day of supernatural sanction has passed." Finally, "The language of Scripture must be interpreted in accordance with our moral reason, no matter what it means to say."

That the authors of such skeptical thrusts at God's law and government, undermining the foundations of

true religion and Christian morality, should be kept in high places of trust and influence is a surprise beyond measure.

Did Voltaire, Mirabeau, Rousseau, or Robespierre ever deal more deadly blows at religion and public morals before or during the French revolution?

The foregoing skeptical sentiments exalt the individual above all human and Divine authority and law for the public welfare.

When the individual becomes supreme, government is repudiated and punishment is repulsive.

4. In contrast with the foregoing sentiments of skepticism, now see what God says:

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2).

"Then shall he say to them on the left, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." . . . "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal" (Matt. 25:41, 46).

Mr. Steward rightly says: "We must either admit the endless misery of hell, or give up the endless happiness of heaven."

"Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation" (Jno. 5:28, 29).

"Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him" (Luke 12:5).

"The rich man also died, and was buried: and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." . . . "Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you, cannot;

neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence" (Luke 16:22-26).

"The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power" (2 Thess. 1:7-9).

"He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden underfoot the Son of God and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the [Holy] Spirit of grace?" (Heb. 10:28, 29).

Sin against the Holy Spirit is the "unpardonable sin," and involves endless punishment. "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world [age], neither in the world to come" (Matt. 12:32). "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation" (Mark 3:29).

5. That all future punishments are endless does not imply their equality; for degrees of demerit are clearly indicated: "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. 5:10).

In these Scriptures are affirmed:

- (1) God's absolute authority;
- (2) His sovereign government;
- (3) His righteous law with its fixed penalties;
- (4) The impartial infliction of punishment.

All these are essential in the Divine government, but are repudiated or ignored by the forenamed skepticism.

6. A vital principle of jurisprudence universally allowed is that "The public good is the ultimate end of all punishment" (Hon. J. J. Burlamaqui). Accordingly, Blackstone cites Beccar: "As punishments are chiefly intended for the prevention of future crimes, it is but reasonable that among crimes of different natures those should be most severely punished which are the most destructive of the public safety and happiness (IV, 11). Hence the grand aim of punishment is the strength and perpetuity of government.

Justly President Mark Hopkins observes: "Punishment is not evil from accident, misfortune from the laws of impersonal nature, nor from an equal, nor from anger, nor for discipline. *Punishment is the vindication of violated rights* by a person through some positive infliction" (Ethics, p. 229). Likewise, Justice Blackstone declares: "Of all parts of the law the most effectual is the vindictory." But apart from the irrevocable certainty of future punishment there can be no vindication of government. This truth is affirmed by Baron de Montesquieu: "The idea of a place of future rewards necessarily implies a place of future punishments; and where the people hope for the one without a fear of the other, civil laws have no force" (Spirit of Law, p. 246).

This principle is so obvious that the most pronounced skeptics admit it. Bolingbroke says: "The doctrine of future rewards and punishments has a great tendency to enforce laws and restrain the vices of men" (Shedd Hist. Christ. Doctr., Vol. I, p. 201). So Mr. Hume confesses: "Disbelief in futurity loosens the ties of morality, and may be supposed to be pernicious to civil society" (Bates, Cyclop. of Laws, p. 483).

All legal authorities allow that the vindication of



righteous government is the most important part of law; and, in order to secure this, punishment is necessary. In other words, to maintain the public welfare supersedes all individual interests; but in maintaining the public welfare, sure punishments are indispensable.

7. Another principle of good government is admitted by all well-disposed and right-thinking people; namely, that the greater the public welfare is the greater is the crime of destroying it. And the public welfare is great in its height and scope of moral character, its blessings enjoyed, and its privileges afforded.

Who can estimate the public welfare in God's government of the universe? To the height and scope of moral character, to the number and rank of blessings enjoyed, and to the extent of privileges afforded there is no limit.

By way of approach, try to weigh the self-interest of an individual against the public good of a municipality of 100,000 population. What would it be as against the entire American government with its 100,000,000 population? For an individual to set at naught that government is to destroy the public welfare and the personal safety of 100,000,000 of people. A step further—what would be the wickedness of destroying the welfare of all the people on earth, about 1,500,000,000 in number? At the same rate, the population of Jupiter is 1,950,000,000,000. Who can weigh the crime of destroying the welfare of so many intelligences? Still more: The population of Alcyone in Pleiades, at the rate of this earth and its inhabitants, would be 23,400,000,000,000,000. Who can measure the present and eternal welfare of so many intelligences? Who can weigh the crime of destroying that welfare?

But this line of thought assumes other worlds to be

constituted like the earth and inhabited! Certainly. And no mere assumption, either. The Scriptures declare "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (Gen. 1:1). "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them" (Gen. 2:1). "Heavens" is plural number.

This likeness between this world and all other worlds is recognized in the universal harmony of all worlds with God, based on the blood of Christ shed in this world: "For by him were all things created, that are in the heavens [Gr.] and in the earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him." . . . "And having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in the earth or things in the heavens" [Gr.] (Col. 1:16, 20).

The atonement is basal and prior to creation: "before times eternal" R. V. (2 Tim. 1:9); "before the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1:4); "before times eternal" (Titus 1:2); "from the beginning" (2 Thess. 2:13); "before the worlds" (1 Cor. 2:7).

And so orthodox theology teaches: "If the mystery of redemption had not been *from all eternity* hidden in God the world would never have come to creation at all" (Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol., p. 382).

"The atonement underlies our very physical life. Grace underlies nature" (Whedon). "Redemptive Trinity precedes creative Trinity" (Pope).

All worlds being attributed to the same creation it is reasonable to infer them all made of the same substance. And science proves this to be so: (1) Meteoric stones from space intercepting the earth in its course are found to have iron, nickel, and other minerals common to the earth; (2) the light from other

worlds reveals, through the astronomical spectroscope, the existence in them of metals common to this world.

And the argument of analogy proves those other worlds to be inhabited as well as this. This conclusion is put beyond doubt by the harmony in those worlds being ascribed to the cross of Christ (1 Col. 1:20), "who is before all things, and by him all things consist" (Col. 1:17)—are compacted into one system.

Now, back to the argument of approach: *Alcyone* is estimated to have over twenty-three quintillions of inhabitants. But there are still larger worlds. Herschel believed *Vega* to be much greater. But there are millions upon millions of worlds with their inhabitants beyond the scope of mathematics to enumerate. Who can span and fathom the wickedness of destroying the welfare of those inhabitants? For every sinner's self-centering and God-rejecting, God-hating (Rom. 8:7) attitude involves the destruction of God's government, maintaining the welfare of the universe. Aye! Still more, that God-hatred (Rom. 8:7) involves the destruction of God Himself! for God declares the hating sinner to be a "murderer" (1 Jno. 3:15).

At first sight, this estimate of the impenitent, wilful sinner may seem harsh; but see, why is God excluded from the sinner's heart? Because the sinner wills it. In that domain he has supreme power. So far as he has power he excludes God. Extend his power to all intelligences, what would be the result? God excluded from all intelligences. Evidently that result would follow. Once more: Extend that supreme will-power of the sinner so as to include all conditions and ranks of created intelligences not only, but also the conditions of being in the Creator Himself, the sinner's excluding would include excluding the existence of God.

To know a sinner you must see him from the stand-

point, God. When you can weigh the welfare of the universe of intelligences, of which the sinner's attitude is destructive, and scale the infinitudes of God excluded by the sinner, and sound the depth of mystery in Christ's humiliation and death (Phil. 2:7, 8) neglected by the sinner, then you will have found the magnitude of the impenitent sinner's wickedness.

That such persistent sinning until death subjects one to endless punishment, who dares declare it unjust?

No demon or devil has ever objected to endless punishment. The leader of the legion that destroyed the 2,000 swine in the sea demurred at their final punishment beginning at that time—"Jesus, thou Son of God, art thou come hither to torment us before the time" (Matt. 8:29), the Judgment Day (2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 6); but no question of the severity or the endless duration of Divine punishment is raised. And to question the justice and goodness of God inflicting endless punishment is to exceed the devil in audacious wickedness. The great skeptic, Theodore Parker, admits: "To me it is quite clear that Jesus Christ taught the doctrine of eternal damnation."

8. Another point: The Divine integrity requires the endless punishment of sin. This is repeatedly threatened in order to prevent sinning. Its certainty is stressed by citing "the angels that sinned," "the flood upon the world of the ungodly," and "turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha into ashes," as "examples unto those that after should live ungodly" (2 Pet. 2:4-6). The endlessness of future punishment is emphasized by citing the fallen angels, "Sodom and Gomorrha and the cities about them," and others who "perished in the gainsaying of Korah," as examples "suffering the *vengeance of eternal fire* (Jude 6, 7). See 2 Thess. 1:6-9.

Endless punishment having been threatened, it must be inflicted upon those who disregard it. Anything less would destroy the Divine integrity, and consequently the Divine government also.

9. Again: The goodness and love of God for the righteous require the permanently wicked to be separated from them (Matt. 25:31-46). Furthermore, this is a manifestation of the Divine goodness and mercy toward the subjects of endless punishment, in limiting them from endless increase of sinning. The term *kolasin*, punishment, in its verbal form *kolazein* means "to curtail, to keep within bounds, to hold in check, to check, to chastise, to correct, to punish" (Liddell and Scott).

The best and the utmost that infinite wisdom, goodness, love, and might can do for the one irreversibly established in sinning, is to curtail, check, and hold him in check, while the vindictory wrath of God is directly inflicted for his persistent attempt to destroy the Divine government (Matt. 25:31-46; Rom. 1:18; 2 Thess. 1:6-10).

10. Finally, self-superinduced permanency in evil cannot cancel accountability. This is a vital principle in ethics.

Albert Taylor Bledsoe, LL.D., has rightly declared that the lost soul "by its own repeated acts of transgression has made sure its eternal continuance in sinning." . . . "No one is authorized to pronounce endless sufferings unjust, unless he can first show that the object of them has not brought upon himself an eternal continuance in the practice of sin. In other words, unless he can first show that the sinner does not doom himself to an eternity of sinning, he cannot reasonably complain that his Creator and Judge dooms him to an eternity of suffering" (Theodicy, p. 305).

If any one objects that a finite being can not com-

mit sin in time, justly incurring endless punishment in eternity, an objection impossible of proof and contrary to the foregoing Scriptures, he must allow that while persistent sinning continues just punishment must continue. Endless sinning carries with it endless punishment. That this hopeless condition is self-superinduced, Dr. Alexander well expresses:

“There is a line by us unseen  
That crosses every path;  
The hidden boundary between  
God’s patience and His wrath.

“To pass that limit is to die,  
To die as if by stealth;  
It does not quench the beaming eye,  
Nor pale the glow of health.

“The conscience may be still at ease,  
The spirits light and gay;  
That which is pleasing still may please  
And care be thrust away.

“But on that forehead God has set  
Indelibly a mark,  
Unseen by man, for man as yet  
Is blind and in the dark.

“Indeed, the doomed one’s path below  
May bloom as Eden bloomed;  
He did not, does not, will not know  
Or feel that he is doomed.

“He feels, perchance, that all is well,  
And even fear is calmed;  
He lives, he dies, he wakes in hell  
Not only doomed, but damned.



"O, where is that mysterious bourne  
By which our path is crossed?  
Beyond which God Himself has sworn  
That he who goes is lost."

Man's self-debasement is appalling. Passing the "hidden boundary between God's mercy and His wrath," the lost soul has no desire to repent. The rich man in hell expressed desire for less torment; for his friends to escape it; but no sorrow for past conduct nor wish to reform (Luke 16:19-28).

Parenthetically, let the reader consider two things: (1) This rich man had been a professor of religion—member of the church in which Zacharias and Elizabeth, Joseph and Mary, and others, lived holy lives. Proof: Abraham calls him son, and he calls Abraham father three times. (2) No crime nor even sin, as men usually reckon, is charged against him. In justification of his punishment he is told, "Remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things . . . and now thou art tormented" (Luke 16:25).

With him self-interest came first. For the public good he took no thought. As for God and His law, he had but slight concern. Instead of this, he preferred self. "Thou receivedst thy good things"—you had your own way. Reader, is this your case?

Man's fall is so great because of the marvelous height from which he fell. Created in God's "image and likeness" (Gen. 1:26), he outranked all creation. He is fearful. He is wonderful in mind and fearful in power. His one act crushed a world and broke the harmony of the universe. In fact, "I am fearfully and wonderfully made" (Psa. 139:14).

See him compared with the angels: Of the angels he saith, "Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire"; but unto the Son he saith, "Thy

throne, O God, is forever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom" (Heb. 1:5-8). And herein man participates. Created for the dominion of this world (Gen. 1:28), he is redeemed for joint-dominion with Christ over all worlds (Rom. 8:17).

Angels "*stand before* the throne of God" (Luke 1:19); but man is redeemed and destined to *sit upon* that throne: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne" (Rev. 3:21).

For a moral being of so high rank as man to turn recreant to his divine trust, and rebel against the government of God, and become "enmity against God" Himself (Rom. 8:7), manifests a moral turpitude transcending all bounds. His banishment and endless confinement in hell (Rev. 21:8) is the only safety of the moral universe.

Man's objection [He is the only being bad enough to object] to future endless punishment always results from degrading God and debasing man. Given the Bible-view of God and of man, endless happiness in heaven for the righteous and endless misery in hell for the wicked (Matt. 25:34-46) are alike Scriptural and required by the moral sense of universal intelligence.

The rapid increase of crime at the present time is closely related to this subject. During 1910 in The United States 10,000 suicides and 12,000 murders were committed. This is appalling!

History shows that doubt concerning future punishment increases crime; that where fear of future retribution departs there "civil laws have no force" (Baron Montesquieu).

Why this loss of belief in future endless punishment? Its cause may be attributed to

(1) The commercialism of the secular press and largely of the religious press also. Gain rather than the public good becomes the controlling policy. The furious racing after wealth and pleasure weakens the moral sense and puts God and His government out of sight.

(2) But more particularly the secularized pulpit is to blame. Appointments and ministers are ranked according to moneyed investment—\$4,000, \$3,000, \$2,000, \$1,200, \$800 men. And popular sentiment very largely decides the kind of preaching. Many ministers in both pulpit and university “are fast displacing the entire conception of God as governor by the conception of God as father,” and exchanging the traditional categories of the saved and the unsaved for the fatal error that all men are children of God, in direct contradiction of Christ’s classifying men as “lost” and saved, and as “children of the devil” (Jno. 8:44), (Matt. 13:38), and “the children of God” (Matt. 5:9). And, ignoring the government of God, they deny future punishment, and exchange future general judgment for misfortunes in time. Some even decry the Decalogue, and doubt the inspiration of the Bible.

Consequently, those doubters deny “sin in the flesh” (Rom. 8:3) and condone actual sin (1 Jno. 3:8) as “largely the wilfulness of freedom . . . rather than any deliberate choice of evil.”

Such false teaching sweeps away the very foundations of private virtue and public righteousness.

How much of the sexual vice [its annual revenue to Chicago alone is reported \$15,000,000] and of atrocious crimes [10,000 suicides and 12,000 murders during 1910 in the United States] should be charged against an unfaithful pulpit is a *grave question*.

The pulpit with its constituency is God’s appointed conservator of the public welfare (Ezek. 33:1-8), the

"salt of the earth" and "the light of the world" (Matt. 5:13, 14); and is therefore chiefly responsible for public opinion in the Christian community.

A merited rebuke is given by Justice Brewer of the United States Supreme Court: "You ministers are making a fatal mistake in not holding forth before men . . . the retributive justice of God. You have fallen into a sensational style of rhapsodizing over the love of God. You are not appealing to the fear of future punishment. . . . The effects of it are seen in the widespread demoralization of private virtue and the corruption of public conscience throughout the land."

Future endless punishment is fundamental in the "Christian faith" on which this Republic was founded. And on this faith depends its continued existence and prosperity.

THE END.

# BROADWAY PUBLISHING CO'S

## NEWEST BOOKS

All Bound in Silk Cloth and Gilt. Many Illustrated

### Fiction

The Eyes at the Window (beautifully bound, with embossed jacket)—Olivia Smith Cornelius.....	\$1.50
Next-Night Stories—C. J. Messer.....	1.25
Arthur St. Clair of Old Fort Recovery—S. A. D. Whipple.....	1.50
Barnegat Yarns—F. A. Lucas.....	1.00
Jean Carroll, with six illustrations—John H. Case	1.50
As a Soldier Would—Abner Pickering.....	1.50
The Nut-Cracker, and Other Human Ape Fables—C. E. Blanchard, M.D.....	1.00
Moon-Madness, and Other Fantasies—Aimée Crocker Gouraud (5th ed.).....	1.00
Sadie, or Happy at Last—May Shepherd.....	1.50
Tweed, a Story of the Old South—S. M. Swales..	1.50
The White Rose of the Miami—Mrs. E. W. Ammerman.....	1.50
The Centaurians—Biagi.....	1.50
The Reconstruction of Elinore Wood—Florenz S. Merrow.....	1.50
A Nest of Vipers—Morgan D. Jones.....	1.50

### Religious Works

The Disintegrating Church—Frederick William Atkinson.....	1.00
Evolution of Belief—J. W. Gordon.....	1.50
Down Hill and Up Hill—Rev. J. G. Anderson..	2.00
A Certain Samaritan—Rev. John Richelsen.....	1.00
The Reunion of Christendom—Francis Goodman	1.50
What the Church Is and What It Should Be—Lafayette Swindle.....	1.50
A Harp of the Heart. (Poems)—Rev. Chas. Coke Woods.....	1.00
The Gospel Parables in Verse—Rev. Christopher Smith.....	.75
Who? Whence? Where? An Essay by Pedro Batista.....	1.00
Compendium of Scriptural Truths—Marshall Smith.....	1.25
The Passion Play at Ober Ammergau—Esse Esto Maplestone.....	1.00
Israel Lo Ammi—Ida M. Nungasser.....	1.00

The Eternal Evangel—Solomon S. Hilscher.....	\$1.50
A New Philosophy of Life—J. C. Coggins.....	1.00
Romance of the Universe—B. T. Stauber.....	1.50
In the Early Days—Adelaide Hickox.....	1.50
The New Theology—By a Methodist Layman— Hamilton White.....	1.00

### Miscellaneous

Anvil Sparks—Radical Rhymes and Caustic Comments, by Wilby Heard.....	.75
The Medical Expert and Other Papers—Louis J. Rosenberg.....	.50
The Little Sufferers (dealing with the Abuses of the Children's Societies)—G. Martin.....	1.50
Eureka, a Prose Poem—S. H. Newberry.....	1.00
Rust (a play in four acts)—Algernon Tassin (of Columbia University).....	1.00
Poems by Charles Guinness.....	1.00
Prohibition and Anti-Prohibition—Rommel, Ziegler & Herz.....	1.00
Gay Gods and Merry Mortals—Verse by Robert J. Shores.....	1.00
The Rubaiyat of the College Student—Ned Nafe.....	.50
The Deluge of England, and Other Poems—James Francis Thierry.....	1.00
The Dragon's Teeth—a Philosophical and Eco- nomic Work—T. M. Sample.....	1.00
Achsa, the Sister of Jairus—Mabel Cronise Jones.....	1.00
The Marriage Bargain Counter—Daisy Deane..	1.50
Building a New Empire—Nathaniel M. Ayers..	1.50
Marriage and Divorce—Jeanette Laurance.....	1.00
The Clothespin Brigade—Clara L. Smiley.....	.75
"Forget It"—Ida Von Claussen.....	1.50
The Last Word: a Philosophical Essay—James and Mary Baldwin.....	1.00

### Travel

Eight Lands in Eight Weeks (illustrated by 90 drawings)—Marcia P. Snyder.....	1.25
Eliza and Etheldreda in Mexico—Patty Guthrie (illustrated).....	1.25

The attention of clergymen is directed to our Religious List, one of the largest of any house in America.

Write for free copy of our magazine, BOOK CHAT.

**BROADWAY PUBLISHING CO., 835 BROADWAY, N. Y.**

Branch Offices:

ATLANTA BALTIMORE INDIANAPOLIS NORFOLK  
WASHINGTON DES MOINES, IOWA





OCT 29 1912







LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 022 190 305 5